

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVIII.

APRIL, 1914.

No. 2.

HISTORY OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

About three years ago THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY (Vol. XIII, No. 4) published an article on the various baptisms practiced by the people of God under the old dispensation. The article in question was part of a paper read before a pastoral conference. The resolution of said conference that the paper be published in its entirety in this periodical has not fully been carried out by the essayist chiefly because of the great length of the paper. This second installment contains the history of the mode of baptism from the beginning of the second century to the beginning of the Reformation. The reader will notice that the right to speak has in the main been given to literary and monumental evidence.

In the year 1873, Bryennios, then Metropolitan of Serra, discovered a very old volume in the monastery of the Holy Sepulcher. This ancient treatise bears the title *Didache ton Dodeka Apostolon*, that is, the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Many critics place its date between A. D. 90 and 100, and none later than 165. In a chapter on Baptism the *Didache* directs: "If you have not living water, baptize into other water; and if you cannot baptize in cold water, do so in warm; but if you have neither, then pour out water on the head three times in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."¹) This oldest evidence regarding the

1) Ἐὰν μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν, εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ βάπτισον· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ἐν ψυχρῷ, ἐν θερμῷ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφοτέρω μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τοὺς ὕδωρ εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος. (Chap. VII, p. 23.)

manner in which Baptism was to be administered at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second clearly shows that the ordinary manner was immersion. But it shows with equal clearness that in extraordinary cases pouring was to be used. If you have neither cold nor warm water in sufficient quantity, "then pour water on the head," says the *Didache*. This direction explodes the oft-repeated claim of the immersionists that immersion was the only baptism known for more than two hundred years after Christ.

In the *Pastor of Hermas*, probably written between 110 and 140, we read: "For before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is consigned over to death; but when he receives that seal, he is delivered from death and assigned to life. Now, that seal is water, into which men descend bound over to death, but ascend out of it assigned to life."²) Here the reference seems to be to plunging or immersion.

Justin Martyr, died 165, says in his *First Apology*, which was written before 139: "Then they are brought by us to a place where there is water, and are regenerated [i. e., baptized] in the same manner in which we ourselves were regenerated [baptized]. For they then receive the washing with water in the name of the Father of the universe and Lord God, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost."³) This also seems to point to immersion.

Tertullian, converted 190, died between 220 and 240, writes: "And indeed it is not once, but three times, that we are immersed."⁴) Again: "We little fishes, after the example

2) Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est: at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur a morte, et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est, in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. (*Pastor Hermas*, lib. 3, simil. 9.)

3) Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθεμεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτῶν ποιοῦνται. (Chap. 61; cf. chap. 62 and 65.)

4) Non semel, sed ter tinguimur. (*Against Præteas*, chap. 26.)

of our Ichthus (Fish) Jesus Christ, are born in the water.”⁵⁾ In the same treatise Tertullian says: “When we have come out of the font, we are thoroughly anointed with a blessed unction.”⁶⁾ And again: “When we are going to enter the water, but a little before. . . . Hereupon we are thrice immersed.”⁷⁾ Once more: “For who will grant to you, a man of so false repentance, one single sprinkling of any water whatsoever?”⁸⁾ This is spoken to such as sham repentance, and thus get Holy Baptism by stealth. The statement obviously contains an antithesis, and does not necessarily imply that Baptism was at that time administered by a single aspersion or sprinkling. We who use pouring would express Tertullian’s sentiment by saying: Who would grant to you so much as one drop of water? No sensible person would infer from this that we administer Baptism by putting one drop of water on the candidate.

We have heard that the *Didache* permitted pouring where immersion was impossible. Are there any such exceptional cases on record? Yes. *Walafrid Strabo*, a German monk and writer (808—849), tells us that St. Lawrence, a Roman deacon who suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Valerian about 258, baptized one of his executioners with a pitcher of water. “One of the soldiers, Romanus by name, fetching a pitcher of water, sought opportunity to give it to St. Lawrence that he might be baptized.”⁹⁾ Again: “He (Lawrence) poured water on his (Lucillus’) head.”¹⁰⁾

5) Nos pisciculi secundum *IXΘYN* nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur. (*On Baptism*, chap. 1.) *Ἰχθύς* (Fish) is an acrostic composed of the initial letters of our Lord’s several names and titles: *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτήρ*, i. e., Jesus Christ, God’s Son, Savior.

6) Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctione de pristina disciplina. (*On Baptism*, chap. 7.)

7) Dehinc ter mergitatur. (*On the Crown*, chap. 3.)

8) Quis enim tibi tam infidæ poenitentiae viro aspergionem unam cujuslibet aquae commodabit? (*On Repentance*, chap. 6.)

9) Unus ex militibus, Romanus nomine, urceum afferens cum aqua, opportunitatem captavit, qua eam offerret B. Laurentio, ut baptizaretur. (*Acta Laurentii*. Strabo, *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, chap. 26.)

10) Fudit aquam super caput ejus. (*Ibid.*)

In the middle of the third century we also hear of *clinic baptism*, that is, Baptism administered to persons on a sick-bed or death-bed. *Eusebius*, 260—339, relates that Novatian, who later became the leader of the sect called Novatians, was “*perichuthesis*,” that is, he had the baptismal water poured over him while lying on his sick-bed.¹¹⁾ On the subject of clinic baptism we have a letter written by *Cyprian*, Bishop of Carthage, in 255. Cyprian writes to Magnus: “You have asked also, dearest brother, what I think of those who obtain God’s grace in sickness and weakness, whether they are to be accounted lawful Christians, because they have not been washed (*loti*) with the salutary water, but have only had it poured over them (*sed perfusi*). In this matter my veredundity and modesty prejudices none, so as to prevent any one from thinking what he wishes and doing what he thinks best. So far as my poor understanding comprehends the matter, I think that the divine benefits can in no respect be mutilated and weakened, nor that anything less can there be obtained where with full and entire faith, both of the giver and of the receiver, those things are accepted which are drawn from God’s gifts. For in the salutary sacrament the spots of sin are not washed away in the same manner in which the filth of the skin and of the body are washed away in a carnal and secular bath, so that there should be need of soap and salts and other helps, and of a large jar, and a pool (*piscina*) wherewith the body may be washed and cleansed. The breast of the believer is washed one way, the mind of man is cleansed another way by the merit of faith. In the salutary sacraments, when necessity compels and God grants His indulgence, the divine abridgment conveys the whole benefit to believers. Nor ought it trouble any one when the sick are seen to have water poured over them (*perfundi*), when they obtain the Lord’s grace, since Holy Scripture says and declares by the Prophet Ezekiel (36, 25): ‘Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will

11) Liber 6, cap. 43.

I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you.' Likewise in Numbers (19, 11 f.): 'He that toucheth the dead body of any man shall be unclean seven days. He shall purify himself with it on the third day, and on the seventh day he shall be clean. But if he purify not himself the third day, then the seventh day he shall not be clean. And that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him.' And again (Numb. 8, 5): 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying: Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them.' And again (Numb. 19, 9): 'For a water of separation: it is a purification for sin.' From this it appears that the sprinkling also of water is of equal value with the salutary bath."¹²⁾

This letter establishes the following facts: 1. At the middle of the third century, immersion was the customary mode of administering Baptism. 2. Only in exceptional cases, such as sickness and extreme danger of life, was this mode departed from in favor of pouring or aspersion. 3. Magnus and others were troubled about the validity and complete efficacy of clinic baptism and about the legitimacy of the Christianity of those who had received it. 4. Cyprian, however, defended and justified pouring and sprinkling as a valid form in cases of necessity.

Several councils discussed this clinic baptism and adopted rules with reference to such as had received it. The *Council Neo-Caesarea*, held in 314, says in Canon 12: "If any man is baptized only in time of sickness, he shall not be ordained a presbyter." Note that his baptism is not declared null and void, nor is it said that he is not a legitimate Christian. He is merely to be barred from the ministerial office. And why? "Because his faith was not voluntary, but, as it were, of constraint." Canon 47 of the *Council of Laodicea*, held about 360, appointed such clinics, if they recovered, to learn the

12) *Epist.* 69, cap. 12 sq.; quoted in Baier III, p. 446, edition of Walther. (See also Walther's *Pastorale*, pp. 118 f.)

creed; but it did not annul their baptism and order them to be rebaptized by immersion.

Basil, Bishop of Caesarea, 329—379, speaks of trine immersion.¹³⁾

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, died 386, says: "For as he that goes down into the water and is baptized and surrounded on all sides by the water, so the apostles were baptized all over by the Spirit."¹⁴⁾

Chrysostom, 347—407, says in reference to the great commission: "Christ delivered to His disciples one Baptism in three immersions of the body, when He said to them, Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," etc.¹⁵⁾ Again he writes: "To be baptized and to sink down, then to rise again, is a symbol of descending into the grave and of coming up from it again."¹⁶⁾

Gregory of Nyssa, 332—395, says: "We cover ourselves in the water, as Christ did in the earth, and this we do three times to represent the grace of His resurrection performed after three days."¹⁷⁾

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, died 397, writes: "You were asked, 'Do you believe in God the Father Almighty?' And you answered, 'I believe'; and you were dipped, that is, buried."¹⁸⁾ Again: "Naked we are born in the world, naked also we come to the font."¹⁹⁾ That all persons were baptized *naked* appears also from *Cyril of Jerusalem*. "As soon as you came into the inner part of the baptistery, you put off your clothes, which is an emblem of putting off the old man with his deeds; and being thus divested, you stood naked."²⁰⁾

13) *De Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 27.

14) *Catech.* 17.

15) Ἐν τρισὶ καταδύσει τοῦ σώματος ἕν βάπτισμα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς παραδέδωκε κτλ. (*Homil. de Fide.*)

16) Τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι, εἴτα ἀνανεῦν, τῆς εἰς ἕδου καταβάσεως ἐστὶ σύμβολον καὶ τῆς ἐκείθεν ἀνόδου κτλ. (*Hom. 40 in 1 Cor.*)

17) *De Bapt. Christi.*

18) Interrogatus es: Credis in Deum, Patrem Omnipotentem? Dixisti: Credo, et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es. (*De Sacram., liber 2, cap. 7.*)

19) Nudi in saeculo nascimur, nudi etiam accedimus ad lavacrum. (*Sermo 20. Cf. Sermo 41.*)

20) *Catech. Mystag. 2.*

Likewise from *Zeno*, Bishop of Verona, in the third or fourth century: "Rejoice, for you went down naked into the font, but soon rose from it, clothed in a heavenly white garment; and whoever has not defiled this, will possess the kingdom of heaven." ²¹⁾ Similar statements are found in *Chrysostom* ²²⁾ and *Athanasius*. ²³⁾ The men, women, and children were usually baptized apart in separate apartments of the baptistery.

Jerome, 340—420, declares: "We are thrice dipped." ²⁴⁾ Again: "Immersing the head three times in the font." ²⁵⁾

Augustine, baptized 387, died 430, has this to say: "After you professed your belief, three times did we submerge your heads in the sacred font." ²⁶⁾

Leo the Great, made pope in 440, died 461, wrote: "The trine immersion is an image of the three days' burial, and the rising again out of the water is an image of His rising from the grave." ²⁷⁾

The literary evidence which we have heard shows that up to the year 461 immersion was everywhere the regular mode of baptism. In exceptional cases pouring was practiced. The Church considered pouring a valid method.

Besides this literary evidence there is also a mass of *monumental evidence* at our disposal. Let us examine some of it. From the *Didache* it appears that in the beginning the converts to Christianity were baptized in the open air in running water. But before long baptisteries were erected, perhaps as early as the first century. H. D. M. Spence-Jones, Dean of Gloucester, Professor of Ancient History in the Royal

21) Gaudete, in fontem quidem nudi demergitis, sed aetherea veste vestiti, mox candidati inde surgitis, quam qui non polluerit, regna coelestia possidebit. (*Invitat. 2. ad Baptis.*)

22) *Hom. 6. in Col.*

23) *Epist. ad Orthodoxos.*

24) Ter mergimur. (*Liber 2. in Ephes. 4.*)

25) In lavacro ter caput mergitare. (*Against Lucifer*, chap. 4.)

26) Postquam vos credere promisistis, tertio capita vestra in sacro fonte demersimus. (*Homil. 3.*)

27) Sepulturam triduanam imitatur trina demersio, et ab aquis elevatio resurgentis ad instar est sepulchro. (*Epist. 4. ad Episcop. Siculos.*, cap. 3.)

Academy, says in his *Early Christians in Rome*: "Quite recent investigations and discoveries have now satisfied Marucchi, the last explorer and student of the catacombs, long the assistant and disciple of De Rossi, that the Cemetery of Priscilla [on the Via Appia] must be identified as the locality of the preaching and teaching of St. Peter . . . , that the Cemetery of St. Priscilla was the 'Coemeterium ad Nymphas beati Petri ubi baptizaverat.' Marucchi has with infinite pains and scholarship proved his point, and has shown to a wondering group of interested scholars the very pools still filled with water in the dark crypts of St. Priscilla in which the great apostle probably baptized the first converts to the religion of his Master."²⁸) Again: "A very remarkable feature in the Catacomb of St. Priscilla are the reservoirs of water which evidently served in very early days as baptisteries. The most considerable of these reservoirs or tanks is on the upper story of the cemetery, and is communicated with by a broad staircase of over twenty-five steps. Marucchi describes it as 'une vaste piscine encore pleine d'eau [a spacious pool still filled with water], desservie par un petit canal.' . . . Another large reservoir of water has been found on the second story of this vast catacomb; other and smaller tanks have also been found."²⁹) Spence-Jones quotes the following from the ancient *Acts of Pastor and Timotheus*: "They [the daughters of Pudens] desired to have a baptistery in their house, to which the blessed Pius (the Bishop of Rome, A. D. 142—157) not only consented, but with his own hand drew the plan of the fountain. There at the festival of Easter 96 were baptized."³⁰) The largest number of baptisteries were erected in the fifth and sixth centuries. They were built in rotunda form after the pattern of the Roman baths. In the inner space there was a fountain, or pool, called kolumbethra, piscina, and (later) natoria. After the ninth century few were erected. This is to be accounted for by the fact that the baptism of adults had by

28) *The Early Christians in Rome*, p. 267.

29) Spence-Jones, p. 270.

30) p. 264.

that time grown less frequent. For the baptism of infants large fonts were introduced. Webster's Unabridged Dictionary shows a cut of one of these spacious fonts.

Of the pictorial evidence Bennett has said in his *Christian Archaeology* (p. 407): "It is most noteworthy that from the second to the ninth century there is found scarcely one pictorial representation of baptism by immersion; but the suggestion is always uniformly either of sprinkling or of pouring." This would be noteworthy, indeed, if it were true. It would flatly contradict the uniform literary testimony which we have heard. A statement by another writer is to the same effect: "The testimony of the catacombs respecting the mode of Baptism, so far as it extends, is strongly in favor of aspersion or affusion. All their pictured representations of the rite indicate this mode, for which alone the early fonts seem adapted; nor is there any early art-evidence of baptismal immersion."³¹ The results of our limited investigation have led us to just the opposite conclusion. On the cover of a fourth century sarcophagus in the Lateran, John is indeed represented as pouring water on the head of Jesus from a bowl. But it has been pointed out by an eminent critic that this portion of the sculpture is a later restoration. The same is true of a mosaic in the Baptisterium Ursianum at Ravenna. I have seen two reproductions of pictures representing the baptism of Christ, both of which suggest immersion. One of the cuts may be found in the *Britannica*, sub voce "catacomb." It is taken from a fresco in the Catacomb of Pontianus on the Via Portuensis on the right bank of the Tiber. Pontianus was a wealthy Christian who lived toward the end of the second century. "In this catacomb there is an ancient baptistery of considerable size, which was richly decorated in the sixth century," says Spence-Jones; others say, probably in the middle of the fifth century. The picture covers one of the walls above the reservoir or tank. The Savior is standing waist-deep in water, His arms hanging at His side submerged halfway between the wrist and elbow.

31) Withrow, *The Catacombs of Rome*, pp. 535 f.

The Baptist, standing on dry ground and leaning forward, holds a cross in his left hand and arm, while his right hand is resting on Christ's head as if about to dip it forward into the water. The other picture is reproduced in Spence-Jones, p. 245. The original is found in the ancient crypt of Luciana. It represents John as aiding Jesus to step out of Jordan in which he is still immersed almost up to his middle. —

We now return to take literary testimony at the period where we left off. The first is that of *Gennadius*, of Mar-seilles, 495. Comparing Baptism and martyrdom, Gennadius remarks: "The one after his confession is either sprinkled with water or else plunged into it; and the other is either sprinkled with his own blood or else plunged into fire."³²⁾

Gregory the Great, 542—604, writing to a bishop in Spain, says: "The reason why we use three immersions [at Rome] is that we may signify the mystery of the three days' burial, so that, whilst the infant is raised three times from the water, the resurrection on the third day may be expressed. . . . There can be nothing reprehensible in an infant's being immersed either thrice or once."³³⁾

The fourth *Council of Toledo* in Spain, held under Honorius I, in 633, has the following in Canon 6: "The immersion in water is, as it were, the descending into the grave, and the rising out of the water a resurrection."³⁴⁾

In 754, the question was put to *Pope Stephen II*: "Whether it is permitted in case of necessity to pour the water on the head of the infant lying in sickness with a cup or with the hands, and to administer Baptism in this manner?" He re-

32) Baptizandus confitetur fidem suam, et post confessionem vel aspergitur aqua vel intingitur etc. (*De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 74.)

33) Nos autem quod tertio mergimus, triduanæ sepulturæ sacramenta signamus, ut dum tertio infans ab aquis educitur, resurrectio triduanæ temporis exprimatur. Reprehensibile esse nullatenus potest, infantem in baptismo vel ter, vel semel immergere. (Liber 1, *Epist.* 43. [41.] *ad Leandrum*. See Walther's *Pastorale*, p. 117.)

34) In aquis mersio quasi ad infernum descensio est: et rursus ab aquis emersio resurrectio est.

plied: "This baptism, if done in the name of the Holy Trinity, will remain immovable, especially when also necessity demands that he who is detained by sickness, having in this manner been regenerated, may be made a partaker of the kingdom of God."³⁵⁾

The 11th Canon of the *Council Celichyt.*, 816, forbids pouring in ordinary cases. "The priests should know that, when administering Holy Baptism, they should not pour the water on the head of the infants, but they should always be immersed in the font."³⁶⁾

Walafrid Strabo, 808—849, wrote: "We must bear in mind that many have been baptized not only by immersion, but by affusion, and may yet be so baptized, if necessary."³⁷⁾

Thomas Aquinas, 1224—1274, while declaring that Baptism may be performed not only by immersion, but also by pouring, prefers the former as the common and safer mode. "It is safer to baptize by immersion, because general custom has it thus."³⁸⁾

The *Synod of Angers*, 1275, is said to have held that trine immersion or pouring was the general custom of the Church.

The *Synod of Nemours*, however, held nine years later, 1284, restricted pouring to cases of necessity, saying: "If a vessel [*vas* = baptismal font?] is not to be had, the water may be poured on the head of the candidate."³⁹⁾

35) Si licet per necessitatem cum conche aut cum manibus infanti in infirmitate posito aquam super caput fundere et sic baptizare? Hoc baptismus, si in nomine S. Trinitatis peractum fuerit, firmiter permanebit, praesertim cum et necessitas exposcit, ut ille, qui in aegritudine detentus est, hoc modo renatus particeps Dei regni efficiatur.

36) Sciant etiam presbyteri quando sacrum baptismus ministrant, ut non effundant aquam super capita infantium, sed semper mergantur in lavacro; sicut exemplum per semet ipsum prae-buit Dei Filius omni credenti, quando esset ter mersus in undis Jordanis, ita necesse est secundum ordinem servari et haberi. (Quoted by Hoeftling, *Das Sakrament der Taufe*, I, p. 52.)

37) *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 26.

38) Tutius est baptizare per immersionem, quia hoc habet usus communis. (*Summa*, P. III, qu. 66, art. 7.)

39) Si vas haberi non possit, fundatur aqua super caput baptizandi. (Hoeftling, *l. c.*)

We notice that at this period Baptism by pouring is beginning to overstep the old boundary of cases of necessity. The explanation may be found in the statutes of the *Synod of Luetlich*, 1287: "In order that the baptizand be not exposed to danger, the head of the child is not to be immersed in the water, but the priest shall thrice pour the water on the child's head with a cup or any other clean and suitable vessel, holding the child discreetly with one hand."⁴⁰

The *Council of Ravenna*, 1311, declared the two modes to be equally valid, and left it to the choice of the officiating priest to use either mode.

The statutes of the *Ecclesia Meldensis*, said to have been written prior to 1430, state: "Note that the modern custom is not immersion in water, but aspersion or pouring water on the head of the child."⁴¹

The *Roman Catholic Agenda*, Mentz, 1513, says: "He shall pour (*fundat*) the water thrice on the head of the child, so that it shall reach his head and shoulders."

The *Roman Ritual*, from which Luther translated his *Taufbuechlein* (1523), states: "Though baptism may be administered either by pouring, or immersion, or sprinkling; yet, let either the first or the second mode, which are most in use, be retained, according as it has been the usage of the churches to employ the one or the other, so that either the head of the person to be baptized shall have a trine ablution, that is, either the water shall be poured on it, or the head shall be immersed."

In his *Sermon on Baptism*, printed in 1519, *Luther* says: "In many places it is no longer the custom completely to plunge or dip the children in the font," etc.⁴²

40) Ut caveatur periculum baptizandi, non mergatur caput pueri in aqua, sed sacerdos super verticem pueri ter infundat aquam cum pelvi vel vase alio mundo et honesto, tenens puerum nihilominus una cum manu discrete. (*Ibid.*)

41) Nota quod usus modernus non est immersio aquae, sed aspersion aut effusio aquae super verticem infantis. (*Ibid.*)

42) "Wiewohl an vielen Orten der Brauch nimmer ist, die Kinder in die Taufe gar zu stossen und zu tauchen, sondern man sie allein mit der Hand aus der Tauf' bezeugt" usw. (Walch X, 2593.)

When the Reformation began, immersion, which had been the rule, was in many places the exception. We are not to suppose, however, that this was everywhere the case. Erasmus wrote: "With us infants are poured upon; with the English they are immersed." In England this practice prevailed till the reign of Elizabeth. In the great cathedral of Milan, Italy, it has survived to the present day.⁴³⁾ In the Eastern, or Greek, Church immersion was strictly adhered to, and is the regular mode up to the present time.⁴⁴⁾ The same is true of the Coptic, Nestorian, and Armenian Churches.

St. Louis, Mo.

C. F. DREWES.

"MECHANICAL INSPIRATION" THE STUMBLING-BLOCK OF MODERN THEOLOGY.

(Concluded.)

17.

Modern theology declines an errorless Bible, not only in the sense that the Bible which we now possess is without error, but also in the sense that the Bible ever was without error. And the plenary, or verbal, inspiration is denounced as "mechanical inspiration" for this additional reason that such an inspiration would make the inspired penmen inerrant. We had reserved this point for the conclusion of this paper, because it exhibits with the most striking clearness the unhappy animus of modern theology, and the flagrant injustice which modern theology does to the old advocates of verbal inspiration.

18.

Gibson devotes an entire chapter¹⁾ to the argument that God, though perfect Himself and able to express His mind perfectly, could not perfectly speak to imperfect men. "Let us

43) Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 117.

44) Guenther's *Populaere Symbolik*, § 107.

1) Chap. XI ("Necessary Limitations — Earthen Vessels") in *The Inspiration and Authority of the Holy Scriptures*, pp. 147—159.

suppose it possible that a document could be constructed in heaven which would have been a perfect revelation of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, desirable for man to know on all the subjects which concern him here and hereafter. What mortal could have read it? For it must have been in a perfect language; and there never has been any such language upon earth, so it must have been in an unknown tongue. And even if that difficulty had been overcome, which of the sons of men would have been capable of seeing and understanding and appreciating the authentic product of heaven's high literature? There would need to have been not only a miraculously constructed book, but a miraculously reconstructed humanity to take it in; and wherein would that have been different from the annihilation of the human race as it is, and the creating of another?" Even if God had sent a whole army of angels fully inspired with heavenly truth, they could not have made known the heavenly truth to all sorts and conditions of men. "As soon as they employed any language under the sun, that moment would their message be involved in the imperfections—crudities, barbarisms, inconsistencies, obscurities, and what not—inseparable from the very best of earth's languages. And if it be supposed that it might be possible for them to supplement the words they spoke by the lives they lived, would they not be out of touch with us, and would it not be quite impossible for us to enter into lives so wholly diverse in nature and in circumstance from ours? And if they came upon us with the impact of superhuman power, would not human freedom be abolished?" Gibson goes on to describe three reasons that placed limitations upon God from which there could be no escape even for Him, because He had, in giving His revelation, adopted the method of speaking by men to men: 1. Man's free agency must be respected. 2. Both the Hebrew and Greek languages were incapable of expressing the divine thought. 3. Literature develops its forms gradually, beginning in its rudimentary state with the legend. Gibson is convinced that even in the case of Paul, for whom he

admits sudden revelations, "there is no evidence of such a miraculous influence upon him as would lift him above the possibility of error." Paul, after his conversion, was indeed an inspired man, and "his inspiration was far more than what we call the ordinary guidance of the Spirit; but even in his case it was not such as to interfere with the natural working of mind and heart, and so reduce him to a mere organ of another's inspiration." The last remarks, in particular, are characteristic of the whole argument: To believe an inspiration that yields an errorless product is to believe an inspiration that reduces the inspired writers to—fountain-pens in the hands of the Spirit.

19.

Dr. Terry²⁾ holds that the belief of the inerrancy of the Bible "has obvious logical relationship to the necessitarian philosophy of human action, and was, accordingly, adopted by the leading churches of the Reformation, which accepted the Calvinistic creed." This means, to believe an inerrant Bible is to believe coerced writers of the Bible. Dr. Terry gloats over the Helvetic Confession with its claim of the inspiration of Hebrew vowel points. This piece of confessional fervor is made to do yeoman's service for modern theology. Dr. Terry damns it by praising it as the "logical conclusion from the postulates of the monergistic theology and the necessitarian philosophy." He rejects the postulates and the conclusion as "a mischievous leaven in the realm of Christian thought," and regrets that "many who reject the necessitarian theology are so accustomed to the use of words and phrases which had their origin in notions of positively secured human actions that they have unwittingly imbibed the theory of the verbal inerrancy of the entire volume of Holy Scriptures." It "involves a distorted notion of the Bible" to speak of it as "an infallible book." "It is apt to convey to the popular mind the notion of an inerrant, infallible monarch, uttering nothing but categorical propositions of what is right and what is wrong. It

2) *Biblical Dogmatics*, pp. 23 ff.

ignores the fact that the Scriptures are a body of various kinds of literature, made up of composite narratives, songs, fables, riddles, parables, allegories, visions, and dreams. In the interpretation of all of these there has never been uniformity of opinion, nor is there likely to be for ages to come. Strong, sweeping abstract assertions of the equal authority of all portions of this multiform volume go for nothing in the face of opposing facts which appear in the various books, and the contents of many of these books are the farthest possible from the nature of a set of authoritative utterances on matters of doctrine or on questions of conscience. It requires only the slightest attention to the facts to see that the entire Scriptures cannot be accepted in all their parts as so many final and infallible decisions of doctrine, valid alike for all times and for all men. The greater part of the Mosaic legislation, that veritable Holy of holies in Jewish estimation, is obsolete to-day for the faith and practice of the Christian world." If this writer, now, regards anything in the Bible as "final and infallible," how does he arrive at such a conviction? We wish to point this fact out here, because it shows that an argument like this proves nothing because it proves too much.

20.

Dr. Strong³⁾ says: "Inspiration did not guarantee inerrancy in things not essential to the main purpose of Scripture." He concedes to Miss Cobbe "that inspiration consists with imperfection," and quotes with approval the remark of Dr. Broaders that the difference between "This is my beloved Son" in Matt. 3, 17 and "Thou art my beloved Son," in Luke 3, 22, should make us cautious in theorizing about verbal inspiration. It is small comfort to be assured that there are no "essential errors" in Scripture.

21.

Prior to these American writers is Van Oosterzee, who held:⁴⁾ "As Theopneustia had different grades, so also had it

3) *Systematic Theology*, I, 215 f.

4) *Christian Dogmatics*, I, 202.

its own limits. This too has been forgotten when the holy men have been conceived of as omniscient, at least as infallible in every respect. 'Il nous faut suffire qu'un chapitre, ou une chose fasse partie des Ecritures pour la croire divinement bonne; car Dieu a prononcé sur elle, comme sur la création: J'ai vu tout ce que j'ai fait, et voilà tout était bon.' (Gaussen.) Few things perhaps have been more prejudicial to the existence of a rational belief in Scripture than such an assertion, which conflicts with the most indisputable facts. In this hypothesis of an absolutely unlimited inspiration, the Sacred Writers at last cease to be men; and a number of contradictions, not merely apparent, but real, presenting themselves in Scripture, can only be removed by an almost desperate mode of harmonizing. It is an important step in advance that even the most believing Scripture expositors of our age candidly confess they are not able to maintain the absolute infallibility of the Sacred Writers *in every particular*. Augustine, indeed, declared long before, in regard to John: *Nec ipse dixit ut est, sed ut potuit, quia de Deo homo dixit; et quidem inspiratus a Deo, sed tamen homo*. 'Nor did he speak of things as they are, but as he was able to express them, because as a man he spake of God; and that indeed as being inspired by God, but yet as a man.' This is the only tenable theory of limited inspiration; necessarily limited by the finite condition, and at the same time by the fallibility of man in regard to all which belonged not to the sphere of God's Saving Revelation."

22.

Dr. Brown, too, evidently stumbles at the claim of an errorless Bible. When noting his objection to the "dictation doctrine,"⁵⁾ this grievance of modern theologians against the "mechanical inspiration" was indicated to us somewhat veiledly. For Dr. Brown holds that the claim of inerrancy does not grow out of anything that the Bible says concerning itself, but this claim is either aprioristic, that is, it is a foregone conclusion

5) See § 13 of this paper.

from a premise that is necessarily assumed, or it is pragmatic, that is, it is an argument based on the practical usefulness of the Bible. In the former case, an errorless Bible is demanded *a priori*, because it is manifestly inconsistent with the veracity of God, the Author of the Bible, to admit errors of any kind in the Bible; in the latter, an errorless Bible is demanded, because a Bible containing error could not serve as a standard of truth in teaching nor as a trustworthy guide in directing man's conduct. In other words, the advocates of "mechanical inspiration" had to reduce the inspired writers to automatons in order to get them to be inerrant. And this, again, was necessary because of the personal honor of the inspiring God and because of the practical value of the inspired product. Inerrant writers of the Bible were needed, accordingly such writers were decreed, and thus a leading humanity of the writers of the Bible was stamped out—for *errare humanum est*—and these writers became impassive instruments, or machines.

There is sarcasm in the remark of Dr. Brown that the errorless Bible thus produced by inerrant human machines is "a Bible which no man has ever seen." This is the rather ungracious reply to the perfectly relevant teaching of verbal inspirationists that the inspirational activity of the Holy Spirit, which produced a Bible free from error, was exercised only when the autographs, or original copies of the sacred writings, were produced, and is not claimed in the same degree for the apographs, or transcriptions made later by copyists.

23.

Quenstedt devotes an entire chapter to this subject:⁶⁾ "An S. Scriptura sit infallibilis veritatis, omnisque erroris expers?" With his customary care he elaborates, by means of a series of distinctions, the exact point in controversy, and arrives at this thesis: "Holy Writ in its canonical and original form possesses the character of infallible truth and is free from every error, or, what comes to the same thing, there is

6) *l. c.*, pp. 77—82.

in the canonical Holy Scriptures no lie, no false statement, no error ever so small, both as regards facts and terms, but each and everything that is handed down in Scripture is quite true, whether it refers to doctrines, morals, history, chronology, topography, or names, and no ignorance, thoughtlessness, or forgetfulness, no slip of memory can or must be charged against the penmen of the Holy Spirit while writing down the sacred letters."

By his remark about the canonical writings in their original form Quenstedt carries the debate about the inerrancy or infallibility of the Bible to the point where it ought to start. This is no evasion of the issue, no asking a change of venue, no flight into a remote region whither few men can follow, but this is stating the real issue. What orthodox teachers have meant when they spoke of the plenary inspiration and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures has always referred, and could only refer, to the original copies of the sacred writings that were produced under the influence of the Holy Spirit. To what extent the copies of the original manuscripts are faithful reproductions of the original is plainly a separate question. This question cannot, indeed, be neglected by a theologian, nor have those theologians who have taught the inerrancy of the original manuscripts neglected the study of the condition of the copies. But this question must be settled along different lines. Most modern theologians meet the claim of the old dogmaticians that the *original* Bible is inerrant with an appeal to the *existing copies*. They either ignore the reference of the dogmaticians to the original, or they ridicule it, as does Dr. Brown. This procedure is so manifestly unfair that self-respecting men would shrink from adopting it in any other business. It is a common rule of justice that you must meet an opponent on his own ground. Every shot that is not fired at the real position of the enemy is a waste and a sham. You may create a great impression of valor on people who do not see through the maneuver, but you weary earnest seekers after the facts in the case.

Even modern theological science acknowledges the existence of a canon of Scripture. It is a very ancient and venerable fact. Modern theologians often magnify the importance of the canon, but they seem to forget its importance at this point. For one of the determining factors for the admission or non-admission of a certain writing to the collection of sacred oracles was the absence or presence of error in it. When the words of the Lord came to the people who first received them, they came as "pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times."⁷ They were self-authenticating. They bore the stamp of the divine Author. They warned men against error, falsehood, frauds, deceptions. They offered themselves as a rule for determining truth and error. And so they were received as the infallible Word of God, and declared the canon.

If now, after four thousand years, we are mistaken in claiming inerrancy for the original Scriptures, certainly the recipients of those Scriptures also were mistaken. Yea, the Scriptures themselves are mistaken in setting up the claim that they are "the Word of Truth."⁸ And the saints of all ages have been mistaken who have always held the belief which Augustine expressed: "Cedamus et consentiamus auctoritati S. Scripturae, quae nescit falli et fallere."⁹ The men who in our day attack Quenstedt for his untenable theory of the inspiration and its effect of inerrancy must consistently attack the men who discovered the difference between canonical and apocryphal writings. For if they accepted the canonical books only because of the amount of religious truth which they detected in them, there is no reason why they should not, on that basis, have accepted also the apocryphal writings. The difference would have been only one of degree and quantity, both as regards the truth and the errors contained in either kind of writings.

7) Ps. 12, 6; Comp. 2 Sam. 22, 31; Ps. 18, 30; 19, 8; 119, 140; Prov. 30, 5.

8) Ps. 119, 43; 2 Cor. 6, 7; Eph. 1, 13; Col. 1, 5; James 1, 18; John 17, 17.

9) *De peccatorum meritis* etc., chap. 22.

24.

The claim of Quenstedt and the class of theologians whom he represents on this matter, *viz.*, that the inerrancy of the Scriptures is predicable only of the original manuscripts, is not meant to depreciate our present Bible. The dilemma which the negative Bible criticism of our days has constructed against those who still hold to the old doctrine of inspiration: Either you must throw away the Bible you have; for you admit that the errorless Bible in which you profess to believe no longer exists; or you must drop your claim of the inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible — this argument misses the point which Quenstedt makes by his distinction between the autographa and apographa of Bible manuscripts. This distinction grants the existence of errors in copies made from the original manuscripts and in versions made from the original text. Speaking particularly of the versions, Quenstedt says: “Versiones omnes alicujus lapsus saltem possibilis accusari possunt, nec ulla earum, quaecunque tandem illa sit, ab omni omnino errore libera est.” The purpose of the distinction is to determine the cause of these errors and, if possible, to correct them. In the copies made from the original manuscripts, and in versions from the Hebrew or Greek texts we have before us purely human products. No believer in the old teaching regarding the inspiration of the Bible has any qualms in conceding, on general principles, that it is likely — *saltem possibilis* — that the imperfections common to the producers will appear in their products; for here the saying is indeed true: *Errare humanum est*.

A respectable science — textual, or lower, Bible criticism — has been busy for two centuries collating the existing Bible manuscripts and eliminating spurious or palpably erroneous texts or parts of texts. Lardner, Bengel, Tregelles, Scrivener, Tischendorf are some of a long list of scholars who have labored, with remarkable perseverance, to give to the world the original Bible text. They have proceeded on strictly objective grounds

and collected evidence for or against this or that reading, just as evidence is collected and the truth established in regard to other matters that are in doubt. Wherever the evidence has not been convincing, they have suspended their judgment. In this way many things that had perplexed Bible-readers have been lighted up. This is a fair way of dealing with the apographa. Says Dr. Enoch Pond: "It has been thought by some that this whole question of inspiration amounts to but little, since we have naught in our hands at present but transcripts and translations, the original copies, which alone were inspired, having long been lost. But we do think it of great importance to have had an *inspired and infallible original*. From such an original all the existing copies and versions came; and though we have not the autographs with which to compare them, still we can compare them one with another; we can judge of differences when they exist; we can judge wherein they differ, if at all, from the original copies, and can thus approximate, at least, to the true standard. The original copies of the ancient classics have all passed away; yet we like to know that there *were* such copies, and by careful revision, comparison, and criticism we can measurably restore them. A copy of the Scriptures, or a version, is a proper subject of criticism. We may properly inquire, not whether the original writers made mistakes, but whether mistakes have not occurred since; whether the copy or the version conforms to the original. Thus far may human criticism lawfully go in this direction, but no further. If it may transcend this limit; if it may go to the original itself, or to what is decided, on sufficient grounds, to have been the original, to pass upon mistakes and errors there, — then we have no standard left. The criticism of copies and versions has come to be a science of well-defined principles, which has been rewarded with most important results. 'But,' as one has well said, 'the criticism of prophets and apostles, the sitting in judgment upon those who preached and wrote by inspiration, and to whom the Spirit of God brought all things to remembrance — this is a new science, one upon which

we do not care to venture, and the results of which we should distrust and dread.' " 10)

This appeal, then, of modern theologians to the lost autographs of the Bible is an *argumentum ad populum*; it is for stage-effect; it is an appeal to the prejudice against the Bible already existing in the carnal mind of the masses. It will not, as its advocates claim, lead the masses to a "proper valuation" and "intelligent respect" of the "real Bible," but it will feed the dislike and nurse the contempt of the Scriptures which already prevail. And, we repeat it, it is not fair thus to treat the Bible. Dr. Pond calls attention to the lost autographs of the classics. We might add the entire science of archeology. What Schliemann has done at Troy, what others have done at Pompeii, at Niniveh, at Thebes, etc., what historical research is doing the world over,—is it not all actuated by the

10) *Lectures on Christian Theology*, pp. 110 f. — "How is it that we are convinced we have the genuine productions of Homer, Xenophon, Tacitus, Virgil, and other ancient writers? Is it not by the transmission of authentic documents, copies, and translations of original works, the genuineness of which is sustained by a stream of collateral evidence, placing the question beyond rational doubt? The Holy Scriptures challenge this proof, independently of other evidence derived from prophecy, miracles, and internal excellence. The facts which exhibit this proof are of the same kind in sacred as in profane literature; but as Isaac Taylor, an accomplished scholar and writer of the present day, remarks in his admirable work on *The Transmission of Ancient Manuscripts*: 'The integrity of the records of the Christian faith is substantiated by evidence in a ten-fold proportion more various, copious, and conclusive than that which can be adduced in support of any other ancient writings; and if only the justice of the case were regarded, the authenticity of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures would never be controverted till the entire body of classical literature had been proved to be spurious.'" "One word in reference to the various readings in versions and manuscript copies of the original text. As Horne observes, 'by far the greater number of various readings relate to trifles, many of which cannot be made apparent in a translation.' We have verbal variations in the different editions of our printed Bibles, but they do not materially affect the sense, neither does one-hundredth part of the various readings in the original. Dr. Kennicott devoted thirty years to the examination of Hebrew manuscripts, but states that he found no variation which in the smallest degree affected any article of faith or practice." Dr. William Cooke, *Christian Theology: Its Doctrines and Ordinances Explained and Defended*. Fourth edition. pp. 70. 73.

same desire—a healthy and legitimate desire—to get back to originals? How much of the credibility of secular events and the authenticity of non-religious personages of history could be ruled out of existence, or rendered questionable by such sweeping assertions as that about the uselessness of inquiring into the character of the Scriptures since its originals are lost?

"Errors" in our present Bible will remain the subject of investigation to the end of days. When Quenstedt makes the admission which we noted above in reference to the Bible-versions, he does not rest the case there. In a dozen chapters on the style, the clearness, the sufficiency, etc., of the Scriptures and on the laws of Bible-interpretation he sheds much light on hundreds of difficulties of the Scriptures. That is a useful way of taking hold of the "errors." Dr. Terry's way is wholly useless. He speaks of errors in a general way, and touches now on this difficulty in the Bible, now on that. But he does not try to explain any one of them. Why, every one of us knew that before. We all experience in regard to all the Scriptures what Peter said about the epistles of Paul (2 Pet. 3, 15. 16). Therefore, we can have no respect for these loud declamations in our day against the errorless Bible. We have respect, however, for those sturdy and honest defenders of the God-given Book who, when they met with a *crux* in the sacred text, went down on their knees and prayed for illumination of their darkened mind and increase of their limited knowledge, and then wrestled with the difficulty like a man. What a mountain of literature could be piled up out of books on the "errors" of the Bible! How much is still going to be written on this subject! In this class of literature we have special studies on special facts, and the combined effects of all these studies is sufficient to hush the sweeping assertion of the erroneousness of the Bible and the flippant remarks about an error here and an error there.¹¹⁾

11) A good aid for studying the method of meeting the claim of errors in the Bible can be found in Strong's *Systematic Theology*, I, 223—242; also in Thesis II of Dr. Stoeckhardt's series of articles: *Was sagt die Schrift von sich selbst?* *L. u. W.* 32, 281 ff.

25.

It is true that Quenstedt, in his arguments for the inerrancy of the inspired writers, appeals to the character of God, and to the purpose which the inspired writings were to serve. He does this when he establishes his thesis that the Bible is free from every error: "III. Ab absurdo. Quodcunque *σφάλμα* et mendacium, quicunque error aut lapsus memoriae prophetis et apostolis tribuitur, non sine blasphemia ipsi Spiritui S. qui per eos locutus est, et scripsit, imputatur. Deus autem Spiritus S. per infinitam suam scientiam nihil ignorare, nullius oblivisci; per infinitam veracitatem et infallibilitatem suam, ne in minimo quidem errare, falli aut fallere; et per infinitam denique bonitatem suam nemini imponere, neminem in fraudem et errorem inducere potest. Labe factatur etiam per illam sententiam Scripturae *ἀδθεντία* et auctoritas, perit fidei nostrae certitudo et infallibilitas. Si enim quaedam in Scriptura occurrunt dubia, incerta, erronea, falsa, unde de caeterorum auctoritate, certitudine aut veritate constabit? 'Si de uno loco dubitare licet, cur de omnibus dubitare non liceat?' inquit ipse Socinus. Et nisi de fidei principio infallibiliter certi reddamur, quomodo fidei *ὁπόστασις*, Ebr. 11, 1, salutis certitudo, et conscientiae tranquillitas demum consistet?" Quenstedt considers it an absurd thing to believe in a Bible that contains error. So do we; and so, in the bottom of his heart, does Dr. Terry, and Gibson, and Oosterzee, and the whole array of modern opponents to "mechanical inspiration." It is a specious display of admiration for the Bible which we observe in these men. From their own premises they cannot regard the Bible as divine, except in a very wide sense. They may deceive themselves as to their belief in the Bible, but they cannot deceive others.

We are now face to face, in Quenstedt, with that aprioristic and pragmatistical argument which we heard Dr. Brown and Dr. Gibson denounce before. Quenstedt holds that any deception and lie, any error or slip of memory that is charged against the prophets and apostles is attributed ultimately to

God the Holy Spirit, who spoke through them; and that would be blasphemy. "In God the Holy Spirit there cannot be ignorance of anything nor forgetfulness of anything, because of His infinite knowledge; He cannot be mistaken or deceived, nor can He deceive any one in the smallest matter, because of His infinite truthfulness and infallibility; and He can work no imposition or fraud on any one, nor lead any one into error, because of His infinite goodness." This is, indeed, a necessary thought, if we accept any direct operation of God in the production of the Bible. We may admit a condescension and an accommodation on the part of the Holy Spirit to the intellectual level of the human agents whom He employed in writing down His utterances, but we cannot conceive of an accommodation to error on the part of God. If this reasoning in behalf of the inerrancy of the inspired writers is aprioristic, what is the character, *e. g.*, of Dr. Gibson's reasoning? Is it not just as aprioristic to reason that, since no human mind could take in the sublime and immense thoughts of God, therefore God could not have offered such thoughts to man? Or, if He did offer them, these thoughts had to deteriorate in the process of transmission because they had to pass through human channels, and obtain their final expression in inadequate human terms? In the matter of transferring knowledge and understanding from a higher to a lower intelligence, this world has witnessed, and is still witnessing, some remarkable achievements of the genius of man. No doubt, before Laura Bridgman and Helen Keller found their trainers, their case had been pronounced hopeless by most intelligent people. Deaf-mutes, feeble-minded persons, epileptics have been considered beyond the line up to which one human mind can communicate with another. It was thought at a time that every approach to the mind of these unfortunate people was blocked by insurmountable obstacles. Yet, what have human sympathy, ingenuity, and patience accomplished with them? And that without coercion. Against most forbidding odds men have succeeded in rousing interest in minds that had sunk into absolute mental apathy and lethargy,

not by reducing those minds to an impassive state, but by tenderly fostering them, and tutoring their feeble efforts. To adduce less formidable instances, a mother is not deterred by the limited understanding of her child, which is beginning to lisp, from speaking to him, and with him. When the abecedarian comes to school for the first time, his teacher bravely takes hold of his feeble understanding and tells him a Bible-story, to which the little fellow may listen open-mouthed and amazed, because there are many things in it that exceed his power to grasp. But he will come and tell his mother that the teacher said thus and so. And if we ascend to the higher educational domain, we find the lecturer in the university on philosophy and the sciences at a great remove intellectually from the students who listen to him, and he is conscious while he lectures that he may not be fully grasped by them. He must tell them facts, too, which they have to accept, at least for the time being, on his authority, but he goes on with his lecture undismayed, and his students afterward repeat the truths he has told them, and discuss them wonderingly among each other. So much man can do in approaching the mind of man without stamping out anything that is in another's mind, rather by quickening every power that resides there. Now, put God in the place of the human mother, trainer, teacher, lecturer. On what reasonable grounds can it be asserted that He cannot communicate such things as He chooses to communicate to men, and make them understand that He wants them to write them down? Surely, the holy writers have expressed their wonder and amazement at the deep things which were spoken to them. God's thoughts were very profound; they were past finding out. But they uttered them, and uttered them as intelligent beings. It is a perversion of the position held by the old dogmaticians to speak of the inspired penmen as "omniscient," as Van Oosterzee does. No defender of the verbal, or plenary, inspiration of the Bible in the age of the Reformation or to-day ever has claimed omniscience for the prophets and apostles. Nor has permanent inerrancy been claimed for them, also out-

side of the moments of inspiration. Quenstedt distinctly says: "Distingue inter apostolos, consideratos ut homines, qui labi et errare possunt, Rom. 7, 15, et spectatos in officio suo apostolico, sive quatenus a Spiritu S. impulsu et agitati sunt et scripserunt, 2 Pet. 1, 21." Only in this latter capacity they had the "privilegium non errandi," and their writings are unquestionably true.

As regards the pragmatism argument, Quenstedt, it is true, holds that the authority of Scripture would be shaken, and our faith in its reliability and infallibility would perish, if the claim that God gave men a Bible not free from error were admitted. "If," he says, "there are in the Bible some things that are doubtful, uncertain, erroneous, false, how are we to be assured of the authority, certitude, and truth of the rest?" He quotes, in favor of his position, the arch-rationalist of the age of the Reformation, Socinus, who says: "If we are permitted to entertain a doubt regarding one passage, why not regarding all?" And he points out the practical consequences of the belief that the Bible contains error: If we cannot be assured concerning the principle and basis of faith,—which the Bible is,—how can there be substantial faith such as Hebr. 11, 1 describes? How can there be assurance of our salvation and peace of conscience?

A pragmatism interest is charged against this position. But is the position, *e. g.*, of Dr. Terry, anything but the sheerest pragmatism? It is just because he and his modern colleagues do not want to acknowledge the authority of the Bible in all things that they attack the *verbal* inspiration and the *inerrancy* of Scripture. It is for this reason that he is pained to see that people will cite particular Bible texts on a given occasion with the evident intention of proving a certain matter correct or false. Modern theology simply would be stopped and put out of business in its scientific elucubrations of what is revealed truth and what not if this "mechanical" way of quoting Bible-texts is to be permitted. A Sunday-school pupil can upset a university professor in two seconds by confronting him with

a text. O yes, pragmatism! On what side is there the coarsest and most unblushing pragmatism?

The defenders of the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures are out of harmony with our times. Our age has decreed that they are theological back-numbers. Be it so. The further back the better. We have wondered whether Quenstedt, too, did not derive comfort from the fact that he knew his teaching and that of his dogmatic confrères to agree with the orthodox past. He concludes the exposition of his thesis on the errorless Bible with a few fine sayings from the fathers. He remembers that Augustine wrote to Jerome: "It seems to me a most destructive belief to hold that anything in the sacred books is a lie, that is, that those men through whom Scripture was ministered unto us have lied in any point in their writings"; and that in the same correspondence occur these words: "I have learned to give only to those books of Scripture which are called canonical that reverence and honor to believe with the utmost firmness that none of their authors have erred in any matter." He concludes with these words of the same author: "If you once admit a lie against such eminent authority, not a particle of those books will remain that could not be questioned." European theology in our days is working very hard to fulfill this prediction of the Bishop of Hippo. American theologians, too, are becoming marshaled in increasing numbers on the side of that teaching which regards the Bible as a human and imperfect production, containing more or less divine elements. Much reverence is still expressed for the Bible, much deference is still shown to its statements. Yea, it is claimed that the new estimate of the Bible is more conducive to faith in it and to piety than the old view. This is, at best, a sad and fatal self-delusion which the advocates of the new view of the Bible practice upon themselves. The manifest spread of infidelity and immorality in the so-called Christian countries of the world in our days is plainly traceable, as to their cause, to the assaults that have been made upon God's Book. Modern theology has started by

taking God out of the Bible, and is ending its fatal mission by taking God out of the lives of men. Even among the conservative churches of Great Britain and America one has to go back almost two generations, to find a testimony like this:¹²⁾ "What God declares must be true. To maintain that his teachings are mixed with error is to charge God either with ignorance or a design to impose upon his creatures, which is absurd and blasphemous. To ascribe any error to the *sacred writers* does not mend the argument. It shifts the difficulty, but does not remove the inconsistency; for the inspired writers do not speak in their own name, but in the name of God. If they *did* speak under inspiration, their word is true, infallibly true; if they did *not*, their honesty is impeached, and their testimony is false as well as erroneous, deceitful as well as fallible. The fallibility and inspiration of the Scripture testimony are terms which cannot stand together—they involve two contradictory propositions which mutually destroy each other. If fallible, they are *uninspired* and *false*; if inspired, they are *infallible*."

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

PRESERVATION IN FAITH.

1 Pet. 1, 5: *Ye are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.*

The First Epistle of St. Peter is written to Christians who "now for a season, if need be, are in heaviness through manifold temptations," v. 6. One should think that the first words of the Epistle would be words of sympathy with their present sad lot. But no; Peter, or rather the Holy Ghost, has a better means of lifting them above trials and troubles.

12) Cooke, *Chr. Theol.*, p. 65.

He begins the body of the letter with a fervent thanksgiving: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again." *Sursum corda!* Think of the wonderful thing God has done by you: He has *begotten you again*. What impelled Him? Nothing of merit or worthiness in you; it was His grace, pure grace, His *abundant mercy*. And the purpose He had in view? You are begotten again "*unto a lively,*" i. e., a living, "*hope,*" a hope sure to attain its end. It is not a Fata Morgana. The firm basis of this "living hope" is "the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Cf. 1 Cor. 15, 17, 18. "Jesus, my Redeemer, lives, I to life shall also waken." — What is the object of that hoped-for treasure? It is an *inheritance* of incomparable beauty, an inheritance "incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Language is inadequate to express its gloriousness; we can speak of it in negatives only. And this inheritance is secure: it is "reserved in heaven for you." This "inheritance" is life eternal, life in the kingdom of glory. What a consolation for the suffering Christians to know: your "inheritance is reserved in heaven for you." In heaven are no enemies of the Christians, hence no danger of its being lost. Well and good; but, the Christian might falteringly ask, what of me? I am still a pilgrim here below in the enemy's territory; the end of my journey is not at hand as yet; shall I not fall into the hands of spiritual robbers and murderers on the way? Shall I be preserved for this inheritance? Most assuredly. Fear not; "*ye are kept unto salvation.*" Ye are *kept*, literally, *guarded*, unto salvation. The apostle would say: I know you have powerful enemies, devil, world, and your own flesh, to contend with, but take heart: ye are *guarded*. "With might of yours naught can be done," but ye are *guarded*. How? Ye are "*kept guarded, through faith,*" *φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως*, through faith in Christ Jesus. But how do I know that I shall be kept in faith? The apostle answers: "*By the power of God ye are kept through faith unto salvation.*" Therein the power of God manifests itself that He preserves faith in us and through this faith keeps us unto salvation. What a sweet,

strong consolation for the suffering Christian who is anxious about his soul's salvation! It is a consolation that has inherent power to strengthen the weak faith of the Christian, and to cause him to rejoice when he looks forward to that time when this salvation shall be revealed, v. 5 b.

Phil. 1, 6: *Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.*

Paul begins his thanksgiving for the Philippians thus: "I thank my God upon every remembrance of you, always in every prayer of mine for you all making request with joy." Why does he thank God? "For your *fellowship in the Gospel* from the first day until now." He thanked God because the Philippians had become partakers in the Gospel, that by God's grace they had received it in faith, and lived in faith of their Savior Jesus Christ. For this he thanks God. God "had begun this good work" in them. When man comes to faith, all thanks therefor are due to God, and to Him only. Cooperation on the part of man is totally excluded. The apostle proceeds: "I thank my God . . ., *being confident of this very thing that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it.*" God "*had begun a good work*" in the Philippians, had brought them to faith by the Gospel, and the apostle is *confident*, *πεποιθώς*, has the firm conviction, is absolutely certain, that He will surely finish it, complete it, until the day of Jesus Christ. Not the Philippians themselves can or will do this, but God, and He only. He will keep them in the fellowship of the Gospel; He will keep them in faith and strengthen their faith. The warrant for Paul's firm confidence is the fact that it was *God* who began this work. His beginning the work is a pledge of its being completed, perfected. In spite of all our spiritual enemies we shall attain the end of our faith, our souls' salvation. Of such precious promises we should boldly lay hold, and be certain that neither death nor life shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord, Rom. 8, 38. 39.

THE CAUSE OF UNBELIEF.

Ezek. 33, 11. *As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live.*

The *wicked* are they who must confess: "Our transgressions and our sins are upon us, and we pine away in them," v. 10. The wicked are they whose sins are not forgiven. When they ask, "How should we then live?" v. 10, the answer is, The wicked as wicked cannot live. Their lot is death, *the death of the wicked*, eternal damnation. Their death is just. "The wages of sin is death." Whose fault is it if they die this death? Their own. They will not *turn from their wicked way*.

Or is it perhaps God's fault? The Lord God declares: "*I have no pleasure*" in their death; my pleasure is for them to *live*. This is God's good and gracious will towards the wicked, though they have richly deserved death. This His gracious will is an *earnest* will. He declares: "*I have no pleasure*" in their death; that should suffice us. But to make assurance doubly sure, God confirms this declaration with an oath: "*As I live!*" His earnest will is their salvation, hence He lovingly implores them: "*Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways.*" God has done all to save them. If they despise His call, they die of their own fault; they *will* to die. Hence God can say: "Why *will ye die*, O house of Israel?" v. 11b. God's will to save man is an *earnest* will; His grace, a *universal* grace. Whosoever knows that he belongs to "the wicked" and comes to a knowledge of his sins and transgressions, shall also know and firmly believe that for him, too, there is grace in store. Rom. 5, 6; 1s. 53, 12; Matt. 9, 13; Luke 15, 2.

1 Tim. 2, 4. *God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.*

The cause why so many men are eternally lost does not lie in God. "*God will have all men to be saved.*" God's will is an *earnest* will; this the verb *θέλει* expresses. It comprises "*all men*"; according to God's gracious will not a single soul

is destined to damnation. How are "all men" to be saved? By "*coming unto the knowledge of the truth.*" This is God's gracious, earnest will. What is meant by "the truth" through the knowledge of which "all men" are to be saved? Christ says: "*I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.*" So to know Christ is to know the truth, the way of salvation. And of this truth we are to have a deep knowledge, an *ἐπίγνωσις*. The head-knowledge does not save, but the deep knowledge of the heart that "Christ is the Way, the Truth, the Life," that "no one cometh to the Father but by Him." We are to know that we, "all men," are by nature unsaved, lost; that our sin separates us from God, but also that this barrier has been removed by Christ. He came into the world to save sinners. To this knowledge "all men" are to come and thus be saved. This is God's earnest will, and hence He has the Gospel preached, the sun and center of which is faith in Christ Jesus; and this "Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," Rom. 1, 16.

2 Pet. 3, 9. *The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.*

In the preceding paragraph the apostle had administered a stinging rebuke to the scoffers who ridicule the idea of Christ's return to judgment. They rest their argument on the proposition: "All things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation," v. 4. In masterful fashion Peter turns their own weapon against these mockers, proving conclusively that they are willful ignoramuses, vv. 1—4.

In the present paragraph he addresses the Christians. Among other things he says: "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise." Why, then, does He delay His second coming? "He is long-suffering to us-ward," *μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς*. Men have sinned and still sin. God might justly punish, but He stays His blow. Why this patience, this long-suffering? Because "*He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.*" God's great love to all mankind is the ground of His long-suffering. The word trans-

lated "*willing*," βουλόμενος, implies deliberate consent. The Lord does *not will*, does *not wish* the death of any sinner. If any perish, it is not because God so willed, so desired, so wished, so decreed. He did not, as Calvin teaches, predestine some people to eternal damnation for the glorification of His sovereign majesty. Negatively and positively His gracious will toward all mankind is here set forth: "*Not any should perish, but all should come to repentance.*" Language can devise no stronger way to express the thought: God's earnest, gracious will is the salvation of all mankind. More emphatically than is done here this truth cannot be expressed: There is no predestination to damnation.

"God will have all men to be saved." "The Son of Man is come to *save that which was lost*," Matt. 18, 11. And He, "the Lamb of God, taketh away the sin of the world," John 1, 29. "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world," 1 John 2, 2. All things are ready. And now God wills, earnestly wills, "*that all should come to repentance*," that all should come to a knowledge of their sin, come to know that by virtue of their sin they deserved to "perish" eternally, come to know that in Christ Jesus there is salvation, firmly believe in Him and His merits, and thus escape perdition and enter into everlasting life. So God is minded towards all. His grace is *universal*. And because He is so minded towards us, He is long-suffering. He will give to all time and opportunity to come to repentance, v. 9 a.

Matt. 22, 14. *Many are called, but few are chosen.*

This passage has been the subject of much discussion. The controversy centers on the word "called," κλητοί. The *tertium comparationis* of text and context is lost sight of, hence the confusion. In his latest book, *Conversion and Election, a Plea for a United Lutheranism in America*, Dr. F. Pieper gives a very lucid explanation of Matt. 22, 14. We take great pleasure in quoting it, the more so because much there

said is pertinent to the matter treated of in this article. We read, pp. 123 ff.:—

Without question, "calling" is used in a twofold sense in Scripture. Rom. 1, 6 "the called of Jesus Christ," *κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, are the converted of Jesus Christ, those actually received into the kingdom of God, the *Christians*. Being called is here identical with being converted or becoming a believer. And this is certainly the meaning of the term in the great majority of passages in the epistles. On the other hand, Matt. 22, 14: "Many are called, but few are chosen," *πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*, distinguishes the called from the elect. According to the context the called are persons toward whom God has omitted no effort, as regards their being invited, with earnest and urgent pleading, to the kingdom of God. But God has expended His efforts upon them in vain. The great majority of them do not obey the call. They are not translated from the world to the Church; they remain *extra ecclesiam*. In this passage of Holy Writ "call" and "conversion" are not identical in meaning. The call, in this sentence, is a person's *invitation* to the kingdom of God, without including his conversion. The same meaning appears in two more passages, Matt. 20, 16; Luke 14, 24.

Next, Calvin's argument, who would determine the character of the call by reference to the *result*, is refuted:—

Over against this it should be maintained: The call is a divine quantity *in itself*, regardless of the *result*. This is most powerfully exhibited Matt. 22. The king's benevolence, evidenced by the gracious terms of his invitation to the supper he has prepared, as well as his anger, enkindled by the contempt with which his invitation is received, demonstrate the intense divine earnestness of the calling even in the case of the *ineffectual* call. Matt. 22 is in subject-matter a parallel of Is. 5, 4: "What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it?" and of Matt. 23, 37: "I would have gathered you — and ye would not." Hence it is quite proper to say that all who live under the sound of the Gospel *may* be converted and saved, as was shown in the preceding chapter. Hence, too, our Confession treats of the call which God directs to all hearers of the Word in such terms as these: "This call of God, which is made through the preaching of the Word, we should not regard as being a mere delusion (*non existimemus esse simulatam et fucatam vocationem*), but know that God thereby *reveals His will*, that He would *work* by His Word, in those called in such manner, that they might become enlightened, converted, and saved. For the Word by which we are called is 'a ministration of the Spirit,' giving the Spirit, or by means of which the Spirit is given, 2 Cor. 3, and 'a power of God unto salvation,' Rom. 1. And since the Holy Spirit would, through the Word, be active, strengthen, and give power and ability, it is God's *will* that we should receive and believe the Word and be obedient to it." Also the calling which remains ineffectual has behind it the gracious workings of divine omnipotence and the omnipotent workings of divine grace. There are *motus inevitabiles*.

Our Confession says of the called who do not come: *Veritati* AGNITAE *perseverantes repugnant*, they offer constant resistance to the truth which they have recognized. The reason why men are able to resist the call: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," while they cannot resist the call of doom which summons them before the judgment-seat of Christ, is, because in His call of grace in time God works through means, while on Judgment Day He operates in glory *unveiled*, ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ. Not only in the latter, but in the former instance as well, the operative power is a divine and omnipotent power. "We believe according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead." But the operations of God through means have the property of being resistible. God working without means, in majesty unveiled, cannot be resisted, as is evident from Matt. 25, 31 sqq., and as is shown at length by Luther in *De Servo Arbitrio*. To say that "the result is the interpretation of the purposes of God" is the smart talk of a would-be wise person.

Matt. 23, 37. *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.*

This "cry of the mother-heart for its perverted and lost child" Jesus utters at the end of His prophetic career, on the last day of His public preaching in the Temple. — "How often would I" — "and ye would not!" How sharp the antithesis between the "I" and the "ye," between Christ's gracious will and the perverted will of the Jews!

Christ first says what *He* willed. This His will He had manifested by His deeds, and it was known to the people of Jerusalem. With the words, "How often would I," etc., Jesus points back to all those signs and wonders which He had performed in Jerusalem, and to all those sayings which the children of Jerusalem had heard out of His mouth. The Lord had often called the inhabitants of Jerusalem to repentance; with word and deed He had manifested Himself as their Savior and Redeemer; with great and precious promises He had lovingly invited them to come to Him. Back of all these admonitions and pleadings was the *vill* of Jesus, the earnest will, to gather them to Himself, "even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings," to gather them to Himself, ἐπισυναγαγεῖν, to convert them so that they might find rest for their souls. "And

ye would not." Herewith Jesus reminds the children of Jerusalem how they had conducted themselves over against Him from the very beginning; He reminds them of their conduct as it was patent then and there. Jerusalem had stoned and killed the prophets, and when Christ had come unto His own, His own received Him not. They had remained aloof from Him, had not become His disciples, had contradicted His teachings, had blasphemed His great signs and wonders; often they had tried to apprehend Him in order to kill Him. Back of this evil conduct of theirs was their *perverted will*. "*And ye would not.*" Thus the Searcher of hearts lays bare the evil counsel of their hearts. — These exhortations and enticements of Jesus had affected the heart and the will of the Jews; they had felt how He was minded towards them; but they opposed their perverted will to His gracious will, and thus hindered the earnest gracious will of Christ: their conversion and salvation. (Cf. *Lehre u. Wehre*, Vol. 43, 200.)

Acts 7, 51. *Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.*

These are words of Stephen, the first Christian martyr. In his address he had recounted all the benefits God vouchsafed to His disobedient people. God had left nothing undone to save them. Oftentimes He had called them to repentance by the prophets. But what had they done? Moses the fathers had refused, v. 35; the prophets they had persecuted, v. 52. By refusing Moses and persecuting the prophets, they had despised the Word, God's Word, that Moses and the prophets spoke; they despised, *resisted, the Holy Ghost*, who spoke through Moses and the prophets. Thus did "the fathers," and "*as your fathers did, so do ye.*" The "ye," the children, had betrayed and murdered the Just One, Jesus, v. 52. Him and His Word they rejected. And now they were resisting the preaching of the apostles, who testified that in Jesus alone there is salvation, and by resisting the word of the inspired apostles, they resisted the Holy Ghost, who is in and with the

Word, Luke 10, 16. Thus they manifested their stiff-neckedness and their being uncircumcised in heart and ears. They closed their ears to the Gospel of Christ and their hearts to the Holy Ghost, who spoke through this Gospel. — Unbelief resists the Holy Ghost. Man hears the Word of God, and in, by, and through the Word the Holy Ghost wills, earnestly wills, to convert man; but man resists the operation of the Spirit in the Word and is thus lost. Whose fault is it? His own, not God's.

The word used for "*resist*," ἀντιπνέετε, is a very strong one. It means: Ye *fall against* Him, i. e., the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost endeavors, earnestly endeavors, to convert them through the Word, and they experience that power from above, but they "*fall against*" Him, they resist with might and main. The Holy Ghost, as it were, tried to storm the citadel of the hearts of the unbelieving Jews, but this earnest will and purpose to take them captive was frustrated by their obstinate resistance.

Hos. 13, 9. *O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help.*

From the study of the preceding passages we have learned that God's gracious will to save mankind is *universal*: "God will have all men to be saved," 1 Tim. 2, 4; Ezek. 33, 11; 2 Pet. 3, 9. — This His will to save man is an *earnest and sincere* will. Besides the emphatic assertions making this truth plain, 1 Tim. 2, 4; 2 Pet. 3, 9, we have the oath of God, "As I live," Ezek. 33, 11, the positive statement of the Savior, "How often would I," etc., and His mournful lamentation over Jerusalem, Matt. 23, 37. With emphasis it is said that it is God's earnest, sincere will that "the wicked turn from his way and live," Ezek. 33, 11; "that all should come to repentance," 2 Pet. 3, 9. To accomplish that end God sent prophets, His mouthpieces, to proclaim His good and gracious will; to that end Christ Himself, the exegete of the Father, John 1, 18, revealed the Father's gracious will in order to gather men unto Himself, Matt. 23, 37; to that end the apostles, men sent by God, preached the Gospel, the power of God unto salvation, Acts 7, 51; Rom. 1, 16. And

through this efficacious Word men are brought to faith and thus are saved. Rom. 10, 17; 2 Cor. 4, 6; Eph. 1, 17. 20. —

Why, then, do not all that hear the Gospel come to faith? Because they resist God's earnest, sincere, and gracious will, and thus *prevent* their coming to faith. "Ye would not," Matt. 23, 37; "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost," Acts 7, 51. This is the Scriptural answer to the question, Why are most men lost? Hence our Catechism says: "Most men obstinately resist the Word and Spirit of God, and are thus lost by their own fault."

These two truths so pointedly set forth in the foregoing passages are summed up and placed side by side in that dictum of Hosea, so often quoted by our Confessions: "*O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself*," — non-conversion depends entirely on man's evil conduct; "*but in me is thy help*" — conversion depends solely on the grace of God.

But here reason immediately interposes: All men by nature are *equally guilty* before God and *dead* in sins, 1 Cor. 2, 14; Eph. 2, 1; aye, the carnal mind is *enmity* against God, Rom. 8, 7; hence, man's coming to faith, or his conversion, is solely and only the work of God. True. Scripture declares: "Ye are risen with Him through *the faith of the operation of God*, who hath raised Him (Christ) from the dead; and you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses," Col. 2, 12. 13. But why, then, — since all by nature are equally guilty and dead in sin, — does not God, whose will to save man is universal, whose grace is free, earnest, sincere, efficacious, grant faith to all? Why is a Saul converted into a Paul, and why is Caiaphas not converted? Why does Peter rise from his deep fall, and why does Judas fall into despair? In other words, why is it that some persons *in preference to others* come to repentance and are saved?

We do not know. Scripture is silent on this point, so we must be silent. What we do know is this: If man comes to faith, this faith is of the operation of God through the means

of grace, Col. 2, 12. "We *believe* according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead," Eph. 1, 19. 20. If man does not come to faith, but remains in his unbelief, it is because, as Christ says, "ye would not," or, as Stephen words it, "ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." Doubting questions of reason must be fought down with the Spirit's weapon: "It is written!" In the school of theology here below the axiom applies: *Quod non est biblicum, non est theologicum*; in the school of theology up above where "we shall see Him as He is," 1 John 3, 2, we shall clearly understand the truth of God's Word uttered by His prophet Hosea: "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help."

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

CURRENT EVENTS.

IN ONE OF OUR ST. LOUIS DAILIES there appeared a letter to the editor written by one who was in doubt as to the genuineness and authority of the Bible and the Christian religion. The letter received many answers, not a few of them advising the doubter to try her fortunes with the Roman Church. By request of the Pastoral Conference of St. Louis Prof. Theo. Graebner published the following answer:—

"TO A PERSON IN DOUBT.

"DEAR MADAM, —

"Permit me to speak for a number of friends who have read your letter in the *Times*, and who note with regret that the simplest and plainest answer, the correct answer, to your request has not yet been given. If I say that the Bible contains the solvent for all religious doubts, I know that I am speaking not only for my denomination, but for all Christians in all denominations. Wherever you find people who trust the Bible as the inerrant revelation of the Way of Life, you will find people who are no longer harassed by such doubts as expressed in your letter. The Bible contains many things to which our natural reason and observation agree. When it describes sin in all its hideousness, its guilt, and its awful consequences, it tells

us things not entirely new. Our conscience bears witness to the guilt of sinning, and our observation tells us something about the consequences of a life of wrong-doing and vice. We know, before the Bible speaks to us, that there is a Power which is able to punish and reward. Even the heathen are not entirely ignorant of His existence. If there are people now who deny the existence of God, they have fallen below the level of the heathen Greek and Roman who knew that there is an Eternal Ruler who is powerful, wise, and just. But that does not relieve our doubts. In fact, here is where they must arise unless the Lord Himself grants us better knowledge. The question is, how escape the guilt of sin, how remove the stain on mind and heart and conscience? The answer to this question cannot be found by any effort of the imagination or of reason. Indeed, it is an answer which is entirely at variance with reason, and which no man can find unless he receives it from the Lord Himself, nor accept, unless he is granted by the Lord Himself such power of acceptance. The Bible teaches that God sent His Son Jesus Christ on earth to redeem the world from sin. Christ is the Savior. He saves us, not merely as a teacher of righteousness, nor by presenting to us in His own example a pattern of virtue which we must imitate to receive heaven as a reward. He saves us by His work of atonement. He bore upon His guiltless soul the sins of the whole world, He bore our punishment when He, the Innocent, was offered up on Calvary. His death on the cross was a sacrifice for the sins of the world. And a complete sacrifice. His body and blood need not be offered up anew. He has wrought a perfect salvation which is procured for, and offered to, the entire world. By accepting Him as the Redeemer, in other words, by believing in Him, we are made children of God, heirs of salvation. We need no priest, no saint to mediate between us and God. The way is open now. We may approach the Father directly, receive pardon for all guilt and the assurance of eternal salvation.

"This is the Way of Life as revealed in the Bible. Read the Scriptures, you will find it there. You say, But that is hard to believe; my reason does not agree to that plan of salvation. True, our reason would never have found such a way. Otherwise there would have been no need for you to write a letter to the *Times*. Reason will find no way out of those doubts. But the Lord, by the Spirit, who addresses you in His infallible Word, is able to make all things plain that now are dark. There, especially in the gospels and in the letters of St. Paul, all who seek will find, because there the Spirit of God works upon the heart of man, and in the heart of man works faith. Then there is no longer room for doubt. There may be temp-

tations, afflictions, that may cause faith to waver, but the means of dispelling such fears is ever at hand in the inspired Word.

"That, in outline, is the faith which the Lord established when He said to Peter, as He said to the rest of the disciples a short time after, that He gave to them the keys of heaven. This is the faith of all Christians the world over. They all accept the risen Savior as their Lord and Redeemer, rely upon His work for the atonement of their guilt, and confess that it is the grace of God alone which has prepared for them this salvation. It is the doctrine of the Lutheran Church as a church. But it is likewise the faith of all true Christians in all churches the world over. Whatever church they may nominally belong to, whether they be called Baptists, Methodists, Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, if they repose their faith in the redemption wrought through the blood of Christ and justification by faith and not by works, they are members of Christ's invisible Church, which has no visible head on earth, but whose head is Christ the Lord in heaven."

PASTOR JEHN, of Howard, S. Dak., calls attention to the fact that the statement in the article on Dr. Stoeckhardt in the last *QUARTERLY* which credits him with exegetical work in 1900-'01 is "historically inaccurate, as he was not occupying his chair that year."

PASTOR JEHN also sends us a letter which was handed him by editors of two different secular papers. The letter has been written by the notorious Pastor C. T. Russell to the South Dakota Press Association. In this letter Russell complains that "the Lutheran Synod" has inaugurated a boycott against his sermons which he has been publishing in the secular papers of the state. It is likely that this arch-proselyter of our day will make his appearance elsewhere in our circles and disturb our Lutheran communities. For this reason we publish that portion of Russell's letter in which he directly attacks the Lutheran Church, and in his cunning way compares our teaching with his own:—

"I am preaching the Gospel. These Lutheran ministers are not preaching it. What they are preaching is anything else than good tidings for all people. They are preaching an eternity of torment for about nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand that have ever been born, and that one or so out of every thousand will get to heavenly glory. I hold that they are preaching the creeds of the Dark Ages and not preaching the Bible. My sermons are showing that the angels gave a correct statement respecting the Gospel. My sermons are pointing out to the people that, while it is true that only a mere handful is now being saved through faith

in Christ and following Him in the narrow way, nevertheless there is a hope in the Bible for many, many others. I am showing from the Bible that the election of the Church at the present time is to joint-heirship with Christ in His kingdom, and that His kingdom will be established in the close of this age, and will inaugurate the New Dispensation of world-wide glory and blessing, and that this is near at hand. Lutherans teach, on the contrary, that Christ may come any day, and that with His coming the earth will be burned up. I present the Bible teaching that 'the earth abideth forever,' and that God will shortly through Christ's kingdom make His earthly footstool glorious, and that this is the significance of the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as in heaven.'

"TWO DIFFERENT HELLS.

"My sermons follow the Bible and teach, as the Bible teaches, that the hell to which man was consigned through the fall is the grave, the tomb, the state of death — not a place of fire, torture, or suffering. I am telling the people what the preachers all know; namely, that the Hebrew word *sheol*, the only word rendered hell in the Old Testament, means the tomb, the grave, and that it is translated, in our Common English Version, grave and pit more times than it is translated hell, and that it always means the grave, the tomb, and never a place of suffering. As surely as these Lutheran ministers are educated, they know that what I say on this subject is the Truth. They cannot deny this Truth, yet they are bound by their ordination vows not to teach this nor anything else except what their particular creed stands for; hence their opposition to my sermons, which is really an opposition to the Bible — to the Truth. But while opposing these, they cannot agree amongst themselves. I am glad indeed that the various sects of Protestantism and Catholicism no longer fight each other and burn each other at the stake. Yet they cannot agree as to what constitutes the Gospel. Otherwise we would have, not different sects and different synods of the same sect, but a united people of God.

"I am neither fighting Lutherans nor others — I am opposing error and advocating the Truth. Christian people of all denominations are getting awake and are studying the Bible like the Bereans of old, to see whether or not these things are so. Bible study classes are springing up all over the earth. My sermons are now to be had in thirty different languages.

"Another point of difference is that I hold, with the Bible, that all humanity, in dying, falls asleep, and that the great awakening time, the resurrection time, will come at the Second Coming of Jesus for His Church, and gradually during the thousand years of His

Reign for the world. I prove from the Bible that while all saintly Christians, begotten of the Holy Spirit, are on trial now, the decision of their cases will be at death, because they have been favored of God to see the spiritual things, to hear and comprehend the Truth, and to be begotten of the Holy Spirit. The faithful unto death will gain the crown of life, but those who draw back will die the Second Death. But with the heathen world, before Christ came and since, the case is very different. It is different also with many who are living to-day in civilized lands, and who enjoy no more light and no more knowledge of God than do people in heathen lands. The eyes of their understanding are blinded by the god of this world, Satan, as St. Paul says. The Bible teaches that all such, when awakened from the sleep of death during the Millennium, will receive 'stripes,' or punishments, in proportion as they knew right from wrong and failed to do their best. But those punishments, or 'stripes,' will not be inflicted by devils and with torture, but will be inflicted by the glorified Christ and the glorified Church, in love, in wisdom, and with a view to correction and reformation. By the end of those years of Christ's Reign, that is to say, at the close of the Millennium, the whole world will be perfect — the earth will be a Paradise, and mankind, restored to the image and likeness of God, will be earth's monarchs; not that all may be expected to profit by the stripes and glorious opportunities of Restitution and uplift, but because the Scriptures tell us that in that time all who fail to make progress and who prefer sin will be destroyed in the Second Death.

"Thus my sermons are showing the people that the great Creator is a Heavenly Father of Justice, Wisdom, Love, and Power; and that Jesus, the Redeemer, did not die in vain, but that the results of His death will be a great blessing, both for the elect Church, now being selected, and also for the masses of the world to be awakened and blessed by Him during the Millennium. This good Message, good tidings, true Gospel, is appealing to the hearts and heads of many. Thus have been reclaimed from infidelity many who previously have been driven away from God and from the Bible by the inconsistencies of the creedal teachings given forth in the name of God, but blasphemously misrepresenting Him as worse than the most depraved of all human beings, and as bad as any devil we could think of or describe.

"What these Lutheran brethren should have done would have been to reform, admit the error that they have been preaching, the slander against God's character, and to have turned around to join with me in preaching the good tidings of great joy which shall yet be unto all people. Then there would be an awakening amongst the dry bones of Lutheranism. A revival spirit would go forth amongst

all denominations. The mouths of infidels would be stopped, and they would fall down with us and worship the great Creator and His Son, the great Savior.

"I have thus briefly stated the difference between the Lutheran brethren and myself. The Editors of South Dakota who think for a minute that anything but a fragment of their readers any longer live mentally back in the Dark Ages are mistaken. They should take note of the fact that the congregations of these Lutheran ministers are dwindling, and that they themselves are ashamed of their doctrines. No able man amongst them would think for one minute of defending the creed of his own denomination in a public debate. What thinking people are attending the ministries of these preachers are doing so under the mistaken thought that they are doing good by giving their presence and their money to support doctrines which they no longer believe. They are surely mistaken in this, for the result of all preaching of Dark Ages fake doctrines and Bible misinterpretations is surely driving the intelligent people of the churches from them, from the Bible, and from God.

"All Christians should trample down denominational barriers, and should try together for a fresh study of God's Word, making sure first that they break the spectacles of their forefathers. As we get back to the teaching of Jesus, the Apostles, and the Prophets, we get back to that which is reasonable, beautiful, harmonious, and helpful.

"It is a mistake to suppose that we have had eighteen hundred years of Bible study. The Bible ceased to be studied before the third century. For fourteen centuries the Bible was ignored and, on opportunity, was burned. The bishops were accepted as apostles, and the twelve mouthpieces of Jesus were ignored. The Reformation Movement brought the Bible forward again. But during the fourteen dark centuries so much error had been inculcated that God's people ever since have been laboring against and more or less succeeding in getting out of it, until now we are in the dawning of the New Dispensation; and with the light of divine blessing shining everywhere, a measure is also shining on the Church and on the Bible, granting the people of God refreshing, and a knowledge of Truth and establishment therein. Meantime all the creeds are attempts to hold the mind back a century or two or three — attempts to hinder real Bible study, attempts to prevent the people of to-day with all of our advantages from knowing more than Luther knew when he suddenly stepped out of darkness into a measure of light — but not the full light.

"Very respectfully,

"(PASTOR) C. T. RUSSELL,

"Brooklyn Tabernacle, New York."

PASTOR RUHLAND sends us a news item from the *Ottawa Evening Journal* for January 29, which is significant:—

Winnipeg, January 29. — A new turn was given yesterday to the evidence before the Royal Commission inquiring into the escape of John Krafchenko, when John Westlake, charged with aiding in the escape, declared that J. H. Buxton had told him that Krafchenko was a Mason and that he (Buxton) was a high Mason, and for that reason Krafchenko was being aided to effect his freedom.

Masons, Buxton told Westlake, did not believe in the noose, and for that reason he was working to save the desperado from the gallows. Buxton also told Westlake that he represented the "upper strata" of Krafchenko's friends, but that the bandit had plenty of friends in the underworld.

When Westlake protested against taking Krafchenko into his suite, saying it was a serious matter, Buxton told him, "It would be more serious for you if you don't." Westlake told the commission that he did not want to harbor Krafchenko, but he was frightened into doing it. Westlake maintained that he had nothing to do with Hagel, Constable Reid, or any others connected with the plot. All the arrangements with him had been made by Buxton.

Westlake will continue his evidence to-day.

IN THE LAPORTE DAILY ARGUS-BULLETIN of February 2, Pastor Eickstaedt, upon request by the editor, published a criticism of Farrar's *Life of Christ*, which is being offered as a newspaper premium by the Bible House of Chicago. Our pastors may receive inquiries regarding this book from parishioners. For this reason we note some of the important exceptions which Rev. Eickstaedt takes to the book:—

Page 219: The baptism of St. John "must still be regarded as a symbol of repentance." This is contrary to Luke 3, 3: John preached the baptism of repentance "for the remission of sins." A baptism "for the remission of sins" is not "a symbol of repentance."

Page 258: The law of Sinai is grossly misinterpreted, because Christ is falsely understood as a new lawgiver. Christ in no wise "extended" the Law, but showed the meaning and purposes of the moral Sinaitical law over against the superficial and shallow Jewish exegesis.

Page 322 the author calls it "the duty" "to make allowance for difference of opinion in matters of religion." Jesus says the very opposite (John 8, 31; Matt. 7, 15) and His apostles likewise (1 John 4, 1; Rom. 16, 17).

Page 418: Instead of pointing out the comforting doctrine of absolution, Farrar vaguely and flatly speaks of "loosing us from idle

traditional burdens" and a "binding upon our hearts and consciences," which is far, far from the real intent of that Biblical passage.

Page 461 says of the Jewish Sabbath that "it was meant to be a perpetual witness." Mr. Farrar forgot to add "under the old dispensation," or "for the Jews," or words to that effect. For the whole ceremonial law, including the Sabbath and other Old Testament holidays, has been abolished by God Himself, as St. Paul Col. 2, 16. 17, clearly says: "Let no man therefore judge you . . . in respect to Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

Page 508, speaking of moral teachers, the book says that "even the very best and greatest of all" (scil. Moses) "has uttered or sanctioned more than one dangerous and deadly error which has been potent to poison the life and peace of nations." Farrar, therefore, does not know that Moses, as the political leader of Israel, when giving political laws, was not restricted by the Decalogue, but, because of the hardness of their hearts, was at liberty to write for his people divorce laws which do not agree with the original institution of marriage. And Jesus does not censure Moses for doing so. Matt. 19, 8; Mark 10, 5.

Page 518: While on page 572 the author speaks of "the inspired narrators of the Gospel history," he says, p. 518: "It may be regarded as all but certain that the first three (Gospels) were mainly derived from a common oral tradition." This is an anti-Biblical thought, well liked by the so-called "higher critics," but unwarranted by facts and apt to irritate and mislead Christians, who justly believe the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures which "cannot be broken" (John 10, 35), because "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3, 16; compare 1 Cor. 2, 13).

THE LUTHERAN WITNESS publishes a Plea for a Fitting Celebration of the Fourth Centennial of the Reformation, which contains the following suggestions: 1. Large gatherings and monster parades wherever feasible; 2. the raising of large sums of money for education, missions, and charity; 3. the erection of monuments to Luther and his fellow-Reformers at least at every Lutheran center of any importance; 4. the establishment of a Lutheran Press Bureau which is to familiarize the world with Lutheran doctrines and principles; 5. to unite the divided Lutheran church-bodies in America.

THE PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS of the Wisconsin Synod engage 101 male and 80 female teachers. Some of the latter have had little or no training for pedagogical work. In order to render them more efficient, the Wisconsin Synod has empowered a committee to dis-

cover ways and means by which female teachers can be taken through a suitable course of instruction. Prof. Schaller reports for this committee that a vacation school is to be inaugurated this summer in the interest of these deficient female teachers. Besides, the Wisconsin Synod desires that young ladies contemplating to devote their services to work in parochial schools be required to take the entire course at the Synod's Teachers' Seminary at New Ulm, Minn.—This plan seems to us to be a rational way of dealing with a difficulty that exists in our body also. There are good reasons why occasionally a female teacher must be engaged for a parochial school. It would certainly redound to the welfare of the school if such a teacher had been given a proper course of training before entering upon her work, or could obtain instruction while engaged in her work.

PASTOR ANDERSEN, of Flensburg, in a lecture advocated casting aside the Old Testament as useless for the teaching of religion. He declared if a youth in our day were to do what Jacob is reported to have done, he would be put in jail. The speaker is pastor of a Lutheran state-church.—Pastor Heydorn, of Hamburg, had united with the Monists. Earnest pastors are questioning the validity of baptisms performed by him. The ministerium of Hamburg demanded that he withdraw from the Monists. Heydorn yielded, "until the church will have changed her views of Monism," but declared that he would continue cooperating with the Monists in works of charity.—Dr. Hunzinger, whose coming to the ministry of Hamburg was hoped to bring about a change for the better in that infidelity-stricken city, joined the Freemasons.

THE SLEEPING HOMER was in evidence in the sanctum of *Lutheraneren* when the following slipped through in a recent issue:—

"The thoughts of God are taken up by weak men and clothed by their imperfect speech, therefore we must be prepared to find even in the Bible signs of imperfection. God filled His witnesses with His Spirit, but did not recreate them heavenly unerring beings. If their memory failed them here and there, or if in non-essentials inaccuracies can be proved, this is not to be wondered at.

"The expression 'moved by the Holy Ghost' is, to be sure, held by many to mean that the Holy Ghost dictated every word and every iota in the Holy Scripture; but this is neither the meaning of Scripture nor that of those who brought about the Reformation."

Protests by readers of *Kirketidende* and *Lutheran Herald* brought an editorial disavowal of the above sentiments. The editor does "not wish to be held responsible for the views on inspiration contained in the article."

MR. HAROLD BEGBIE has spent much time in India. In *The Continent* (Chicago) he gives his impression of the effect that European culture and Christian missions have had on India's 300,000,000 people. He portrays the modernism of India thus:—

"She is modernized and materialized; she is no longer a shivering child aghast at the dark, or a cowering slave afraid of a priestly master; she is half skeptical and half cynical; she laughs at her gods and reads Herbert Spencer; she washes off the sacred paint from her forehead, and discusses the rival advantages of petrol and acetylene gas; she becomes a little excited by political rhetoric, taking the new word of freedom into her blood like a strong wine, and delighting in controversies which engaged the ponderous minds of the encyclopedists, or which now agitate Browning societies, and local parliaments, and students in university examinations.

"She is young, heady, and excitable, yet withal she is cynical and jaded—the fanatics among her millions are not numerous. It is a miracle in itself—the calm and wearied way in which India has awakened into the miracle of her sudden modernism. She is young, heady, and excitable on occasion; her prevailing mood is one of half-interested amusement, of bland curiosity to know what will happen."

Regarding the Christian missions he says:—

"No church has conquered India; no missionary has left a Livingstonian mark upon her soil; no masterful theologian has convinced her that the Christian religion is superior to Hinduism, Mohammedanism, or Buddhism. But the Spirit of Christ moving upon those dark and stagnant waters, in the simple kindness and loving charity of individual Christian people, has troubled the soul of India, and moved it to a new wonder. For ages, for long ages, the religions of India have been hardening into a dreadful despotism. For ages and ages, millions of people in India have been perfectly content to know themselves as 'untouchables'—outcasts and pariahs. For ages and ages, the whole vast population of Hindus has accepted, without wonder or mutiny, the exacting tyranny of the Brahmin, paying tribute to the tyrant, and submitting in every social detail to his scornful dominion. And in all these ages, religion has seemed to them a hard and terrible way of escape from a doom infinitely more hard and infinitely more terrible—the doom of having to live."

How the old religions of India, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism, are striving to resist the steadily growing influence of Christianity, Mr. Begbie tells as follows:—

"The priests, who fear Christianity far more than they dislike the British raj, are striving to make their religions reasonable and attractive. They see that if they lose the pariahs, 70,000,000 of them,

they will lose all. Their lives are at stake. Hinduism must be saved in order to save them. And their method is to copy, as closely as possible, that humanitarian aspect of Christianity which has so startled and so deeply moved the soul of their millions. They build hospitals, they go back to their oldest books to find a pure god and a merciful goddess."

In reading Mr. Begbie's very interesting account, one hardly is able to rid himself of a troubled feeling regarding the genuineness of much of that Christianity which is proposed to Hindus for their acceptance. "Humanitarian aspect of Christianity" — this does not sound good. Humanitarian efforts have never lasted long nor touched the real spot in the lives of sinners.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—

1. *CHRISTIANITY IN OPERATION.* A doctrinal paper submitted to the District Synod of Oregon and Washington by *Rev. O. Fedder.* 41 pages; 12 cts.
2. *SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL MISSION STATIONS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.* A doctrinal paper submitted to the District Synod of Minnesota by *Prof. W. Moenkemoeller.* 57 pages; 18 cts.
3. *CONCERNING CHRISTIAN GIVING FOR THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.* A doctrinal paper submitted to the District Synod of Texas by *Rev. H. Studtmann.* 56 pages; 18 cts.
4. *MIGRATION OF THE ISRAELITES TO THE LAND OF PROMISE.* A doctrinal paper (third installment) submitted to the District Synod of Iowa by *Rev. C. Runge.* 54 pages; 18 cts.
5. *ROMAN DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND ITS REFUTATION.*—*The Divine Calling of Our Parochial School-teachers.* Two doctrinal papers submitted to the Central District Synod, the former, a continuation of a paper that was begun last year, by *Rev. W. Moll.* 53 pages; 15 cts.
6. *THIRD ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.* (Continued.) A doctrinal paper submitted to the District Synod of Central Illinois by *Rev. F. W. Brockmann.* 57 pages; 18 cts.
7. *CHRISTIANS AS LABORERS FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD.* A doctrinal paper submitted to the Western District Synod by *Prof. G. Mezger.* 69 pages; 19 cts.
8. *DANIEL.* A doctrinal paper submitted to the District Synod of Kansas by *Prof. A. W. Meyer.* 52 pages; 15 cts.

9. *FUENFZEHN ANSPRACHEN AN NEUAUFGENOMMENE GLIEDER* unter Zugrundelegung der Gemeindeordnung, dargeboten von A. Pfotenhauer, Pastor. 48 pages; 10 cts.

The Missouri Synod is a federation of autonomous congregations. Intelligent members are an absolute prerequisite for the operation of such a body. How new members upon their admission can be taught the duties and privileges of membership in their congregation by having the meaning and application of the various paragraphs of the congregation's constitution explained to them, is shown by these brief addresses which the author has delivered on such occasions.

HOMILETISCHES REALLEXIKON nebst Index Rerum. Von E. Eckhardt. *Die Schule*. 352 pages; \$1.60 and carriage.

This is Vol. 6 of Rev. Eckhardt's enterprise, previously noted in these pages. It is devoted to the classification of our literature on all subjects that have some connection with the school.

THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS DAY IN INDIANA. 24 pages; 5 cts. Send orders to Box 702, Indianapolis, Ind.

This brochure shows the sinister ways and questionable means that were employed to secure the passage of House Bill 463 of the Legislative Session 1913 of the Indiana Legislature, by which "Discovery Day" was made a legal holiday in Indiana through the political influence and maneuvers of a secret, oath-bound society in the Roman Catholic Church of our country.

The Northwestern Publishing House announces a new periodical, *THE NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN* — first issue January 7, 1914 — of eight pages octavo.

This latest Lutheran periodical is to be the English paper of the Wisconsin Synod. It offers sound reading-material in acceptable form.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York City:—

1. *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. Edited by James Hastings. With the assistance of John A. Selbie, M. A., D. D., and Louis H. Gray, M. A., D. D. Vol. VI. Fiction — Hyksos. 890 pages.

171 contributors have filled also this latest volume of the E. R. E., the general character and scope of which we have set forth in reviews of the preceding volumes, with a wealth of information. We have here extensive ethnological studies in the articles on Fiji, Formosa, Guiana, the Hamites and East Africa, Hawaii, the Hungarians, and the Finns; also in the articles on the Gypsies, the Hopi, Iupa and Huron Indians; historico-religious studies in the articles on the Greco-Egyptian Religion, the Greek Religion, Hinduism, Health and Health Gods, Hearth and Hearth Gods, the Hieroduloi, the Flagellants, Foeticide, Gnosticism, Fire Gods, Freemasons, Society of Friends, Gallicanism, the Greek Orthodox Church, the Hittites, the Huguenots, the Hussites. The many contributions by W. Crooker and G. A. Grierson on India will be especially interesting to students of the Christian missions in that country. Among the two dozen

biographical articles, some of which are exhaustive critiques (Hume, Hooker, Hobbes, Hillel, Herder, Hegel, Heine, Grotius, etc.), we were particularly interested in the notice of Matthias Flacius by James Strahan. Flacius is fairly represented as the greatest church-historian of the Protestant Church of his day and "the pioneer of modern Bible exegesis," "always sincere, if not always dispassionate in behalf of the Lutheran Church and the purity of the faith," and his labors against Melancthon and the Leipzig Interim are declared "an imperishable service to the Protestant cause." Foxe's *Martyrs* is said to have grown out of Flacius' *Catalogus*. Of Flacius' error the author speaks sympathetically, thus: he became the "unfortunate propounder of a doctrine of original sin which was rejected by friend and foe alike as a revival of Manicheism."—A few quotations at random may illustrate the quality of the theological genius of the contributions. The assignment of two articles on "forgiveness," one on f. in the O. T. (Henry Preserved Smith) and the other on f. in the N. T. (W. F. Cobb), is ominous, and becomes odious when one follows the exposition of the idea especially in the first article, which treats the O. T. largely from the view-point of the historical school of higher criticism. The second article is better, though here, too, sanctificational elements are admitted into the teaching of forgiveness. Luther is correctly quoted as identifying forgiveness and justification, and his attack on the Roman Catholic machinery of forgiveness is appreciated, but the later development of the doctrine of justification by the scholastic dogmaticians, especially in the Reformed Church, the author deplores. "The scholasticism of a Calvin differs in form, but not in method or spirit, from that of an Anselm or an Aquinas." (p. 81.)—Donald Mackenzie, in the article on "Free Will," shows how this *quaestio vexata* has caused confusion because the real issue at stake in the controversy, the government of God and the responsibility of man, has not always been placed in the center of discussion. This also accounts for the strange opposition on this question between authors who are moral affinities. Accordingly, the author holds that "Principal Cunningham"—justly, we take it—"took Hamilton to task for identifying predestination and philosophical necessity." He adds: "We must discriminate between what thinkers are defending and what they are denying. Thus Augustine denied free will in order to defend God's free grace. The defense was the real aim; the denial was incidental." The emphasis which the author sees may be admitted, provided it is held that what Augustine denied deserved denying, and would have been denied, had there been no Pelagian controversy. Harnack's remark which the author quotes makes it questionable whether the author would be so understood; for Harnack holds that Augustine's doctrine of sin and grace "as an expression of psychological religious experience is true; but projected into history, it is false." Moreover, the author declares later that "we must take our stand on the moral nature of man," and that "the problem of Freedom" is this: "to determine whether the consciousness that things could have been otherwise—that evil might be abolished, that responsibility is a fact, that punishment is not a fiction—is possible of vindication on any *Weltanschauung* that can gain the respect of the reason." (pp. 124 f.)

—In the composite article on "God" the contribution of W. T. Davidson contains this interesting remark: "A distinction between Luther and Calvin is discernible—still more marked between Lutherans and Calvinists—in the conception of God which appealed to them respectively. Calvinism is a 'theology' indeed, a doctrine of God throughout the length and breadth of its teaching. The glory of God is exalted, all else is banished or abased. God is celebrated in His omnipotence and omniscience, in His sovereign and inscrutable will, in the grandeur of His eternal, inscrutable decrees, God in His soleness and absoluteness, in the accomplishment of His will rather than in the manifestation of His character, a will that instantly silences opposition and irresistibly effectuates its own purposes. Lutheran Christology, on the other hand, admitted a closer approximation of God to man than orthodoxy had always allowed. It emphasized the love of God manwards, the self-emptying on the part of the Eternal Son, the quasi-deification of His humanity in the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*. The contrast between Lutheranism and Calvinism furnishes a striking example of the fact that theoretical identity of creed is consistent with almost incredible divergence of spirit and temper." (p. 265.) We accept this statement to this extent, that the genius of Calvinism exhibits, indeed, a God that the Lutheran does not know.—H. R. Mackintosh sums up his remarks on "Grace" thus: "Catholic and Protestant conceptions of grace are eventually incapable of being merged in a higher unity. To the Catholic, grace is ethical in aim, yet at the same time hyperphysical in character and operation, dispensed through an infallible and hierarchical institution, and charged with a mysteriously sanctifying power which is manifest supremely in the Sacraments. To the evangelical Protestant, grace is the free active love of God to sinners, so personally present in Christ as to elicit faith by its intrinsically persuasive content. It is no mere supernatural force emitted by Deity,—which might have no relation to Jesus, or only the barest,—but the Father's will of saving mercy in the person of His Son." (p. 367.) This distinction is correct, and the chasm that yawns between Romanism and evangelical Christianity is shown still more strikingly by the special article of the Romanist E. L. Van Becelaere,—which, by the way, states the Roman doctrine much more fully than the Protestant has been stated by Mackintosh, whose remarks are insufficient when he begins to outline the working of the *gratuitus Dei favor* which appeared in Jesus Christ, and the means whereby it operates.—The article on "Heredity," the contribution of P. N. Waggett, contains the following: "Of Original Sin (see Sin) it is impossible here to say more than that, whatever was the change or failure indicated by that doctrine, it was not an acquired character in the sense of biology. What is indicated is a fall, or failure to rise, in the relation between the spirit of man and God. The doctrine itself is not a gratuitous accusation of the race of man. It is the utterance of optimism under pressure of the experience of moral paralysis and temporal suffering. Its positive equivalent is the statement that we cannot measure either the dignity of man's origin or the splendor of his destiny by his present position and his present moral accomplishment. A will better than the will

he exhibits is the origin of his being, and a virtue beyond his own present power is the end of his calling. It is not the Christian who declares the misery of man. What all men acknowledge the Christian interprets as the eclipse of a dignity which, through the moral effort made possible by divine gift, man is invited to regain." (pp. 607 f.) This remark is sufficiently clear to make the withholding of an opinion on it unnecessary until the article on "Sin" shall have appeared. The *πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες* in Luke 11, 13, certainly indicates "an acquired character," so do all the remarks of the Lord about the corrupt trees, corrupt treasure of the hearts, the things that proceed out of the heart, indicate a character that fallen man has acquired in consequence of the fall. Though this condition of depravity, or character of corruption, is not the *materia hominis*, and hence not subject to physiological research (biology?), it is ascertainable in its effects also by the biologist, whom the theologian can really teach something regarding certain baffling problems in heredity which the biologist studies. — In the article on "Freemasons," by E. L. Hawkins, we notice a denial that Freemasonry is a religion, if religion be defined as "a system of faith in, and worship of, a Divine Being." (p. 120.) Even on the basis of this definition there will be hundreds of our readers to take issue with the author, and cite declarations of Freemasons against him. — In Joseph Turmel's article on "Gallicanism," that defunct French revolt from popery, we find nothing said about the most recent acts of the French Government and the Pope. The author holds that Proposition 24 of Pius' IX Syllabus is "purposely vague" on the temporal power of the popes. The author holds: "No doubt they (the popes) did not renounce the right (to depose kings), but they no longer exercised it; they did not even dare to formulate it." (p. 163.) He also believes that "French Catholics — like those of other countries — think that they may be Gallicans on this point without violating orthodoxy." This author has not fathomed the "tolerari potest" of Leo X. We also believe, in fact, we know, that there are Catholics who sincerely believe they can deny the temporal authority of the popes and still be good Catholics. They all change their belief, — and some change their church-connection, — when the time comes for them to be better informed. — In J. L. Paton's article on "Gambling" we have found this pertinent remark: "The immorality of gambling may be argued on higher grounds than a calculation of pleasure. (a) Every gambling transaction involves a transfer of property in one shape or another. When the gambler is asked why he stakes his money on a game or a race, his reply is, 'To add an interest to the game.' The interest thus added is, simply stated, the interest of acquisition. If the real object were, as is claimed, merely the sport and the excitement, then men might just as well wager counters, or, for the matter of that, agree to hand over all winnings to public charities. But this is not done. The transfer of property, in one shape or another, is essential to the act. There are only three ways in which property can be legitimately acquired — by gift, by labor, and by exchange. Gambling stands outside all of these. (b) Its motive is, however, carefully disguised, covetousness. It is an attempt to get property without paying the price for it. It is a violation of the law of equivalents.

It is a kind of robbery by mutual agreement; but it is still robbery, just as dueling, which is murder by mutual agreement, is still treated as murder. It is begotten of covetousness; it leads to idleness. (c) It is, moreover, an appeal to chance. If in any contest skill comes in, odds are given or handicaps arranged so as to equalize the chances as far as possible. To make chance the arbiter of conduct is to subvert the moral order and stability of life. (d) It concentrates attention upon lucre, and thereby withdraws attention from worthier objects of life." (p. 166.) That commercial speculation is gambling the author affirms; that life insurance is such he denies.

2. *HISTORY OF RELIGIONS*. By George Foot Moore, D. D., LL. D. I. China, Japan, Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, India, Persia, Greece, Rome. 637 pages. \$2.50.

This volume is excellent reading, both because of the abundance of information one can gather from it, and because of the facile pen of the author, which has enabled him to give us his learning without appearing learned. The pages of this book are almost free from references; the few that are given were indispensable. An exhaustive bibliography and a judiciously compiled index enhance the value of this book, which is really a *multum in parvo*. A fair library has been condensed into each one of its chapters.

The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.:—

1. *JESUS IN THE TALMUD*. His Personality, His Disciples, and His Sayings. By Bernhard Pick, Ph. D., D. D. 103 pages. 75 cts.
2. *THE CABALA*. Its Influence on Christianity and Judaism. By the same author. 116 pages. 75 cts.

Among modern scholars who may speak with authority on matters Judaic, Dr. Pick ranks very high. These two small volumes from his pen evince not only his thorough acquaintance with the ancient Jewish literature, the Talmud in all its constituent parts, from Mishna to Midrash and the Zohar, but also his mastery of the literature which in the course of eighteen centuries has grown around these oracles of decadent and decayed Jewish religiousness and theosophy. These two books are just as informing and illuminating as Dr. Pick's contributions years ago to the *McClintock and Strong Cyclopaedia*, with the additional merit that the information here offered is brought up to date through Dr. Pick's extensive and close reading of the most recent investigations, such as Prof. Dalman's Talmudic and Jellinek's and Mather's Zoharic studies. We know of no books that could serve a person who seeks quick, compact, and adequate information on the hostile attitude of Judaism toward Christianity better or as well as these. Besides, Dr. Pick writes down his facts in plain and lucid statements, which makes the perusal of his books a pleasant task. Incidentally, the student of Luther's works finds in these two writings of Dr. Pick not a little material that helps to show, by external evidence, the justice of Luther's severe judgment on the Jews. Dr. Pick, we imagine, would be the man to give us a monograph on the correctness of Luther's opinion of Judaism.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.:—

1. *LIFE PICTURES FROM SWEDISH CHURCH HISTORY.*
By Nils Forsander. 160 pages.

In a very pleasing style and in a spirit of reverence and gratitude Prof. Forsander, of the Rock Island Seminary, has here told the most interesting events and described the prominent characters in the history of the Swedish Church, from Ansgar in the ninth to Rosenius, Wieselgren, and Fjellstedt in the nineteenth century. The last chapter shows the Methodist influence in the "läsare" movement, which was a protest against the spiritually defunct state church of Sweden.

2. *THE STORY OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION* of
the Association of English Churches of the Augustana Synod
held in Galesburg, Ill., October 22—26, 1913. 78 pages.

The Macmillan Co., New York City:—

THE CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION OF MODERN LIFE.
By Charles Henry Dickinson. 327 pages; \$1.50.

The social movements of our time, which are multiplying at a prodigious rate, are in most cases movements away from the Christianity of the Bible. Either they discard the Bible entirely, or they advocate a new emphasis in Christian life, an emphasis not on doctrine and dogma, but on mutual love, social service, and works, thus reducing the Bible to an ethical code useful for inculcating practical righteousness in man's dealing with his fellow-man. This treatise, too, is begotten of the "social passion," but it differs from other books on the same subject, inasmuch as it seeks to *spiritualize* the social passion. The author acknowledges the influence of Eucken, Bergson, John Edward Russell, and the late Heinrich Julius Holtzmann. He divides his book into two parts: I. The Radical Division in Modern Life; II. Jesus and Modern Life. In the first part he seeks to show that in modern life there is a struggle between two forces that began with the dawn of Christianity. He holds that our civilization is a Hellenic inheritance, while our Christianity came to us from the Semitic Jesus, who "has no original part in the Hellenic culture." Hellenism absorbs in its progress every potency it encounters except His. "Ever more dissonant to its conquering march through the world and the times, sounds His voice, never to be silenced: Change your estimates, desires, purposes, for the kingdom of God is at hand." (p. 4.) The two last chapters in his First Part the author devotes to a delineation of the hostility which he recognizes between modern civilization and Christianity. He says:

Surely no devout soul that has learned of Jesus can fail to be profoundly influenced by Him. But it is possible in all honesty to accept many things from Jesus' life, teachings, personality, unfolding of His historic influence, and yet to put them to the service of a life and aim essentially different from His. Multitudes do this unconsciously; many, better instructed, with a clarifying of definite intent; up to those who know and teach a religion which gratefully receives from Jesus purity, devotion, and compassion, beyond the devout pagan of the olden time, but turned to that universal conception, that inclusive aim of life, for

which the Galilean did not live and die. This is a "modern paganism" which is the opposite of the fleshly and hideous decadence which usurps that title.

This Hellenic life, free, rich, beautiful, of well-ordered, self-restrained buoyancy of soul, a life deepened, broadened, disciplined personally and socially by the experience of centuries, possessor of vast wealths which include visions, joys, energies of the Founder of Christianity, and developments from Him, cannot be excluded from any realm. It is a life that permeates all interests; it is religious therefore in its action in all realms. Brought face to face with a radically different spiritual consciousness, it righteously asserts itself in competition, nor can it concede a single one of its own attainments, nor limit their scope. Its unlimited freedom scorns an authority external to the human soul. Inalienable are the rights of an exultant vision of a world good and beautiful, its goodness and beauty to be realized by humanity's self-attainments and world-conquests: right of responsive joy to every invitation of earth and sky, with awakenings of nobler gladness by the challenge of resistances to be overcome, exploited, and permeated by the soul; right of resolute action in all conflicts and problems, as these unfold, to subjugate every condition to human progress; right of the invincible spirit of youth, intensifying and deepening to the last day of mortal life, and expectant of new worlds of conquests yet to be.

Against every repression and limitation these forces rise with indignant mastery. Against every bribe of Heaven or threat of Hell, they are as Shelley's Prometheus before the futile wrath of Zeus. Against every voluptuous solicitation of faith the temptress, to find security and rest in her caressing arms from the problems, strifes, and agonies of real living, they are as Orpheus rendered insensible to the song of the sirens by his own mightier harmonies. The only religious appeal except its own to which this spirit can listen must accept the critical acumen of its historical investigation and rational analysis, and welcome its demand to live. When an appeal that fails of these requisites is made in the name of Christianity, we must reject it, oppose it, destroy it, for the truth's sake, and for the sake of men, who live by the truth, estimating any apparent or incidental loss of character and spirituality to be of small account against the higher good. A Christ that does not fulfill this life in every range of its functioning cannot be the Lord of life. To accept that Christ is to pass into condemnation. The Christianity which the religious demands of our cultural inheritance may consider must not only welcome their freest energies, but intensify, complete, and perfect them.

Christianity's first right is the right to be itself. However intertwined its history with the developments of our civilization, it keeps an underlying consciousness of ineradicable difference. When civilization becomes most enfranchised from the interferences of our religious inheritance, triumphantly asserts its own rights, and is confident of self-sufficiency, so that an age of brilliant cultural progress seems ready to say to Christianity, "I have no more need of thee," then the Christian spirit most radically asserts itself, unfolds its powers from its own source, and differentiates itself most clearly from the competitive inheritance.

Least favorable to Christianity are the times of its imperious intrusions into the functions of civilization. Its conquest of the Roman Empire, its medieval dominations, Protestant state churches, theocracies of Geneva and New England, were gains of the world in which it all but lost its own soul. Dethroned from its usurpations, exiled into its native wilderness, it may again find its Lord and itself. Though in the search there are wanderings and perplexities, losses and distresses, yet the compulsions of the pilgrimage are redemptive disciplines that will never suffer Christianity to be merged into the cultural achievements which

it is its purpose to transform. The mightiest renaissance of our inherited culture forced Christianity to the most vigorous renewal of its self-assertion against the world.

The author's language and style are too abstract. Those who requested him: "Write the spiritualizing of the social Gospel in words not too hard for us," will hardly find their wish fulfilled in this book.

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York:—

LECTURES AND ORATIONS. By *Henry Ward Beecher*. Edited by *Newell Dwight Hillis*. 330 pages; \$1.20.

THE MESSAGE OF DAVID SWING TO HIS GENERATION. Addresses and Papers. With an Introductory Memorial address by *Newell Dwight Hillis*. 300 pages; \$1.20.

Both the men, some of whose literary productions are offered in these volumes, withdrew from the churches in which they had been reared and served, because of disagreement in doctrine, Beecher from the Congregational and Swing from the Presbyterian Church. There is nothing in these volumes that relates to the crises in their lives, but quite enough to explain why that crisis came—their peculiar theology.¹) The selections made from their writings serve chiefly to exhibit their literary skill and the ethical tendencies of their work. Of the nine lectures of Beecher those on "Puritanism" and "The Reign of the Common People" perhaps exhibit best the spirit and genius of the author. Of the thirteen addresses of Swing the most interesting are those on "Henry Ward Beecher" and on "The Duty of the Pulpit in the Hour of Social Unrest" (delivered during the Chicago riots in 1894). The address on "Martin Luther" is disappointing. The points of agreement and difference in both authors can be seen in their treatment of such national characters as Charles Sumner and Wendell Phillips, to whom each of them has devoted a lecture, and from the lectures on William Ellery Channing (Beecher) and Phillips Brooks (Swing).

Sherman, French and Co., Boston, Mass.:—

OUR MODERN DEBT TO ISRAEL. By *Edward Chauncey Baldwin*, Ph.D. 219 pages; \$1.25.

We have in this volume seven chapters written in such a plain and animated style that the average reader will follow the author's presentation of facts with the greatest ease. We regret that this feature constitutes the greatest, we had almost said the sole, merit of the book. For the author's thesis proves to be propagandic for that form of socialism which is in our day advocated by Prof. Rauschenbusch. It is a characteristic claim of this social movement that "the ideals of Christendom are rapidly changing." (p. 203.) Ours is a "generation that believes in social justice in the present to be a more desirable, as well as a more attainable goal to strive

1) Beecher's defection from the old faith, *e. g.*, is plainly shown in his speech at the Herbert Spencer Dinner.

for than future sainthood." (p. 204.) Our age "no longer distinguishes between this world as the domain of Satan and the next as the realm of God." (p. 205.) Accordingly, we are returning "to the social outlook of the prophets, priests, and sages of Israel." (The sages are represented by the hagiographa in our Hebrew Bibles.) The author endorses Rénan's view of the Jews as "the first socialists," and gives us a presentation of the teachings of the Old Testament by the three classes of writers whom he names that relates exclusively to social justice and social service. The Christ-messages, the Messianic background of the Old Testament, have no place in the author's account. We do not hesitate to declare his delineation of the works of Israel's great men one-sided and garbled. The things for which he claims that we are indebted to the Jews can be duplicated from pagan literature, and we question the sweeping assertion that modern scholarship has established our moral and intellectual dependence on Hebrew rather than on Greek influence. (p. 7.) At any rate, we are sure that Dickinson has more truly traced the influences which have come to our race both out of Athens and Galilee. (See chap. I, "The Two Inheritances" in "The Christian Reconstruction of Modern Life.") The author's parallels are sometimes far-fetched, *e. g.*, Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address traced to Nahum's "taunt song" over doomed Assyria, p. 50 f.; the sacrificial meals in Samuel's times traced to "the modern picnic dignified by the presence of a clergyman to say grace before the food is eaten," p. 100. On the other hand, the author has in a number of instances shown the moral superiority of the statement of certain truths as made by the Old Testament writers, and statements of a kindred truth by pagan writers. — There is one thing for which all mankind is indebted to Israel that the author has not touched. Jesus names it in John 4, 22: "Salvation is of the Jews." Our Savior was a Jew, and His redeeming work and atoning sacrifice is not least understood from the abundant premises in the writings of the Jewish prophets and priests. The only Jew that can really benefit modern society, that can heal all its diseases, and make it truly free, is Jesus of Nazareth, the prophet whom Moses foretold, the priest after the order of Melchizedek, the scribe instructed unto the Kingdom.

Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Werner Scholl, Leipzig:—

1. *CHRISTENTUM UND MODERNE WELTANSCHAUUNG.*

Von Carl Stange. I. *Das Problem der Religion.* Zweite Auflage. XX and 118 pages. M. 3.

The author devotes the long prefatory remarks which he has prefixed to the second edition of his treatise to reviews of and replies to his critics. He has made only slight verbal changes in the contents of the five chapters of his book. Like Dickinson, whose treatise we have mentioned elsewhere in this issue, Stange posits a decided hostility between the modern *Weltanschauung* and religion. "The difficulties of the present situation are that the principles of modern science seem to leave no room for a religious view of the universe (*Weltanschauung*), and that, hence, Christianity is more and more losing its connection with the consciousness of our times." (p. 17.)

The determining factors of the modern *Weltanschauung* are 1) penetration of nature and reliance on sense-perception, 2) great respect for scientific methods of thinking. To save the cause of religion and Christianity, there has arisen a modern science of religion which has for its object "to comprehend the fact of religion in connection with the human consciousness." (p. 18.) This science of religion is still debating the question whether "the religious phenomenon is merely an *accidental* modification of the general elements of the intellectual life" of man, or whether it is "a *necessary and integral* element in the human consciousness." The modern science of religion divides into two schools: the one seeks the solution of the problem of man's religion by the history of religion, the other by the philosophy of religion. The author decidedly favors the latter, in which he regards Kant as the genius and authority, and, after Kant, Schleiermacher, the advocate of the theory that religion is "neither knowing nor doing something," but "a matter of the immediate self-consciousness" of man. (p. 43.) Religion is a peculiar sort of human experience. Within his self-consciousness man forms his religious concepts, *e. g.*, the concept of God. He "experiences" God, however, not in a sensual way, like toothache, but through a necessary reflection which asserts itself with his consciousness, such as the reflection of his dependence on a higher power. The last chapter is devoted to a description of "the historical character of religion." "Every religion is, in its essence, belief in a supersensuous power."—Pending the settlement of the problem of religion, we shall continue to preach the Word, in season and out of season. There has never been a time when Christianity has not been ruled out of order by the *Weltanschauung* existing at the time being. And there never will be. What a waste of energy are all these extrascriptural *Weltanschauungen*!

2. *DER URSPRUNG DES CHRISTUSGLAUBENS.* Von Reinhold Seeberg. 62 pages. M. 1.80.

"This treatise is devoted to the greatest riddle in the history of the mind of man. Its aim—stated from the standpoint of the history of religion—is to discover the origin of the trinitarian idea in strictly monotheistic Judaism. For the belief in Christ, to which we shall devote our attention in these pages, is, at the same time, the origin of the trinitarian belief. The question before us is: How was it possible that a member of a fanatically monotheistic nation, who had died an ignoble death, in a few years came to share divine honors, and that thenceforth the entire world and especially the nations which are intellectually the most prominent have been able to see in this crucified Jew the Lord of heaven and earth?" (p. 1.) Such is the author's program. He declares in the preface that his brochure is to be regarded "purely as a historical investigation and not as a confession of his faith." But throughout his treatise he speaks like a man who is personally convinced of the truth of what he presents. Besides, he has nowhere indicated that his belief in the divinity of Christ is differently derived from that of the people about whom he writes—the disciples and the early Christians. The

author holds that the origin of the belief that Christ is God dates not from His birth, but from His baptism, at which "the Spirit of God entered into Christ." The activity of Jesus now came to be regarded as a manifestation of the divine Spirit and divine power. After His resurrection He gradually becomes deified. Peter's declaration in Matt. 16, 16 is treated thus: "Not a dogmatical confession of the 'divinity of Christ,' which it is impossible to conceive during the earthly life of Jesus(!), is expressed by the famous words of Peter, but the title of Messiah (which he applies to Christ) merely paraphrases the fact that the party in question was the possessor ('Traeger') of the divine Spirit, for the purpose of consummating the history of God's nation." (p. 7.) John's "Logos" is a peculiar terminology which the evangelist has taken over from Cerinthus the Gnostic. (p. 42.) In fact, John's account of the incarnation represents a late development of the Christ-belief. (p. 59.) While the other evangelists gather the first impression of the divinity of Christ from the descent of the Spirit on Him at His baptism, John's prologue shows a new "christologischer Ansatz," in that it connects the divinity of Christ with His birth. John, accordingly, betrays a certain "embarrassment" when he speaks of the baptism of Jesus. — The origin of the Christ-belief has been stated by our Lord in His reply to Peter, Matt. 16, 17.

3. *REDEN UND AUFSÄTZE VON ADOLF STOECKER.* Mit einer biographischen Einleitung herausgegeben von Reinhold Seeberg. 276 pages. M. 4.50.

Besides the highly appreciative introduction by Seeberg, who delineates "Adolf Stoecker as a historical personality," this volume offers abundant and pertinent material from Stoecker's own pen by which we are enabled to know the man who founded the Christian Socialist Party of Germany, and incurred the displeasure of the imperial court of Germany.

4. *BROCKEN VOM SONNTAGSTISCH.* Ein Jahrgang Predigten ueber einzelne Verse der sonn- und festtaeglichen altkirchlichen Evangelien. Von Dr. A. Matthes, Superintendent und Oberpfarrer am Mariendom zu Kolberg. 473 pages. M. 4.50.

The unique feature of the seventy-seven sermons in this postil is the manner in which the old Gospel pericopes are treated. The author selects one or more verses of a pericope and explains them in such a way as to make them appear as the characteristic portion of the entire pericope. The phrasing of the themes and parts seems to have been dictated by the devotional spirit, or by the practical needs of the congregation, rather than by logical text-division, and the style is often highly poetical, almost turgid. *E. g.*, the very first sermon for I. Advent (Matt. 21, 9) presents "The Advent Prayer: 1. it stirs its pinions in a fervent Advent longing; 2. it is borne up by the Spirit's breath of the Advent promise; 3. it soars aloft to the throne of the Advent Prince." On IV. Epiphany

(Matt. 8, 26) the author depicts "Jesus' Attitude over against Little Faith: 1. that little faith which is fearful in temporal distress; 2. that little faith which trembles because of the guilt of sin; 3. that little faith which prays to Him who is willing to strengthen faith." On Good Friday (Luke 23, 46) the author describes "The Brightest Light Shining from out of the Deepest Darkness," showing that "the last word of Jesus is 1. a fervent hosanna in His profoundest suffering; 2. a mighty Amen affixed to His entire life; 3. a blessed hallelujah because of the victory which He has gained." On Reformation Day (Matt. 5, 3) we are told that "The First Beatitude of Our Savior Gives us the Assurance that the Work of Luther is the Work of God: 1. it opens up to our view the fountain-head and source of the Reformation; 2. it presents to us the sum total and the consummation of the Reformation." The sermons breathe the spirit of evangelical Christianity, denounce the hostility of modern men to the divine Christ and the divine Bible, try to preach repentance and faith, justification and sanctification,—with a distinct emphasis on the latter,—but they lack that clearness of thought, plainness of diction, and directness of address which we should look for in popular discourses to the masses in Germany.

5. *PREDIGTEN UEBER AUSGEWAELTE EVANGELIEN-TEXTE* von Prof. Dr. Carl Stange. 211 pages. M. 4.

The twenty-six sermons in this book—all but two from the old Gospel pericopes—were preached at the services of the university of Greifswald. They are reverent talks on the great saving truths of the Gospel from the fullness of the old pericopal texts. There is in these sermons no striving for effect by the mere choice of term and the ornateness or intricacies of style and construction. The language is noble, bespeaking the erudite character of the preacher and adapted to his noble thought, but it is so plain that one forgets the fact that a university professor is the speaker, and that the same person knows how to speak in an altogether different style if he chooses. A few examples may show how Dr. Stange employs the old Gospels to set forth Christian truths. On VI. Epiphany (Matt. 17, 1—9) he speaks of "The Twofold Testimony which the Lord Receives in View of His Approaching End: 1. He recognizes the way of suffering as the consummation of the revelation of God; 2. He travels to the end of the way of suffering, the Father looking on." Septuagesima (Matt. 20, 1—16): "The Right Way to Strive for the Reward of the Lord: 1. while we are striving for this reward, we must look only upon God and His gift, 2. and not upon ourselves and our achievement." Laetare (John 6, 1—15): "The Glory of the Son of God Revealed by His Care for the Temporal Wants of the People: 1. He sympathetically recognizes their need; 2. He energetically addresses Himself to procure them help." Judica (John 8, 46—59): "Natural Man Cannot See the Honor and Glory of God; for since the heart of man is by nature wicked, it is unable 1. to render the Lord the honor due Him; 2. to see that by the work of the Lord the honor of God is glorified." Quasimodogeniti (John 20, 19—31): "Living Easter Faith is Pos-

sible Only as Faith in the Lord: 1. faith in the resurrection of Jesus is a living faith only when we recognize in the Risen One the Lord; 2. when we recognize in the Risen One the Lord, our faith in the resurrection of Jesus is really a living faith." Reformation Day (Matt. 22, 1—14): "The Indifference of our Hearts is What Separates the Men of our Day from the Living God: 1. that is the reason why many refuse His invitation; 2. that is the reason too why many who obey the invitation still are lost." — Themes and parts are not indicated in these sermons in the exact form in which we have just now presented them. In the typography of the sermon they do not appear at all, except by the numbering of the parts, and it is doubtful whether much stress was laid on them in the spoken sermon. But the fundamental thought is always there and is logically followed out in its ramifications. — Great care has been bestowed on the introductory remarks, which always foreshadow the dominant thought of the text, and which are of almost equal length in every instance. In fact, each sermon seems to have been timed to last a fixed period. — In these sermons we have found Jesus acknowledged as the Lord, the Son of God, the Savior, the Sinless One, the Almighty. We have met with the acknowledgment that the human heart is the seat of depravity, that its spiritual restoration is owing only to divine grace, that the mission of Jesus was to suffer, etc. But the substitutive, or vicarious, character of the suffering is implied rather than stated with that distinctness with which the author has set forth other truths.

6. *DIE THEOLOGIE DER GEGENWART.*

This periodical enters upon its eighth year. The first issue contains a review of publications in the domain of Systematic Theology by Dr. Gruetzmacher, with an appendix on Norse Theology by Prof. Dymling. In the second issue Dr. Uckeley reviews the status of Practical Theology during 1913.

7. *NEUE KIRCHLICHE ZEITSCHRIFT.* 35th year.

In No. 2 Dr. Mahling writes on "Volkskirche, Volksseele, Volksseelsorge, Volksmission"; Lic. theol. Koerner on "Dr. Erasmus Alber's Doctrine regarding Marriage"; Dr. Kunze on "Faith and History." In No. 3 we have a paper on "The Genesis of Johannes von Hofmann's Doctrine of the Atonement," by Dr. Wapler; a paper on "The Tasks of the Evangelical Ministry in Modern Congregations," by court-preacher Scholz, and an unfinished paper by Pastor Kuehn on "The Problem of the Sermon on the Mount."

CORRIGENDUM.

In the January No., p. 63, the three last lines should read: These stories of the Swedish novelist Runa (Elisabeth Beeskow), which have been done into good German, breathe the spirit of Protestant Christianity.